

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XXXII No. 6 DECEMBER 1949

THE REPORT ON POPULATION

THE "population problem" is a problem that has been with us at least since the days of Malthus, but the way in which it has presented itself to the people of this country has altered radically since the publication of the famous *Essay*. During the nineteenth century it seemed as though the fears of an over-crowded country, even an over-populated world, for which Malthus had suggested certain remedies, might in fact be realized. In Great Britain there was an almost four-fold increase, from approximately 10 million people to about 37 million. At the present time, the population has reached the figure of approximately 48 million, of whom just over 42 million are in England and Wales. It is worth noting that, although there is an actual increase taking place in the population of the country, the rate of increase has declined in the last fifty years, from about four million per decade to less than two million per decade. The actual increase may be tabulated as follows:

<i>Period</i>	<i>Increase (thousands)</i>
1871-81	3,638
1881-91	3,319
1891-1901	3,971
1901-11	3,831
1911-21	1,938
1921-31	2,026
1931-41	1,810

It might be assumed, on a superficial reading of the situation, that this increase in the population was due to a steadily rising birth-rate, and it was thought, at one time, that this was

the explanation of the extremely rapid increase in the population of this country during the nineteenth century. In fact, however, the birth-rate, for the greater part of the century, remained steady at about 35 per thousand, and declined, with increasing rapidity, from 1880 to 1939. The explanation of the total increase in the size of the population is to be looked for rather in a declining death-rate, and the steady development of medical and social amenities, which have succeeded in prolonging the life of the average citizen. In 1870 the average expectation of life in this country was 43; in 1949 it is 65 years.

The marked decline in the birth-rate prior to 1939 caused considerable misgiving, and even alarm, among demographers and students of population movements. The Population Investigation Committee, associated with the names of Dr Glass and Mr Blacker, made appeals for funds to carry on further investigations, and succeeded in obtaining the Population (Statistics) Act, 1938, for the purpose of acquiring full information with regard to family structure and fertility. Finally, in March 1944, a Royal Commission, under the chairmanship of Lord Simon, was set up, "to examine the facts relating to the present population trends in Great Britain; to investigate the causes of these trends and to consider their probable consequences; to consider what measures, if any, should be taken in the national interest to influence the future trend of population and to make recommendations". This Committee, under its second chairman, Sir Hubert Douglas Henderson, presented its report to Parliament in June of this year.¹

The Report, a volume of over 250 pages, with 49 tables and three charts, and a vast amount of statistical information, is not always an easy document to read. After an introductory chapter it is divided into four parts.

Part I, entitled "The Trend of Population", deals with the history of past growth and present decline of the birth-rate, discusses causes of family limitation, and forecasts future trends in the size and composition of the population of this country.

Part II, entitled "Population and the National Interest", examines principally the economic consequences, in terms of

¹ *Royal Commission on Population. Report.* (Cmd. 7695.) (His Majesty's Stationery Office. 4s. 6d.)

food-supply, employment, standard of living, of a declining population, and points out some of the social and cultural adjustments which will be necessary as a result of this decline.

Part III is entitled "Trend of Population and the Family". It examines the economic position of the family, and the size of the family in different classes of society. It suggests a number of financial and social means of assisting parenthood, and of maintaining the size of the family.

Part IV summarizes the conclusions of the earlier parts of the Report.

While it is not possible to give, in short compass, a full survey of the contents of the Report, it may be worth while to analyse some of the arguments and conclusions which are presented by the Commission. For example, the Report does not accept the suggestion, made principally by American investigators, that there has been a decline in human fertility during the last fifty years. The decline in the birth-rate has been due, the Commission insists, not to lessening fertility, but to voluntary limitation of the size of the family. It has been, as Mr Titmuss indicated in his book, *Parents' Revolt*, the cumulative effect of a number of personal decisions taken by husbands and wives all over the country. The motives for these personal decisions may have been both varied and mixed, and the Report rightly insists that the final result is due to an involved complex of causes.¹

¹ "The above brief review of some of the features of the great transformation in the social environment and outlook that was taking place during the nineteenth century shows that powerful economic, social, and cultural forces were all tending against the acceptance of an uncontrolled birth-rate. With the decay of the family handicraft system, the family was declining as an economic unit, women and children were no longer joining in income-earning activities at home, and at the same time the age for starting work outside the home was being raised. The period during which children were an unrelieved expense to their parents was being prolonged. For this reason, and because of rising standards of parental care, parenthood was becoming more costly. In industrialism also, the struggle for security and social promotion was intensified, and in this struggle parents and children of small families enjoyed an increasing advantage over the larger families. An uncontrolled birth-rate became increasingly incompatible also with the changing outlook of the people, to which the growth of science, the development of popular education, growth of humanitarianism, and the emancipation of women were contributing. Inter-related with these changes was the unprecedented growth of population and the fact that, before family limitation became widespread, large families, because of the lower death-rates, were more common than they had previously been. These changes combined to prepare the way for family limitation; they made individual control over the size of family seem desirable or necessary. At the same time the means of control had become more readily available by the invention of new and better methods of contraception, and the psychological barriers to their use were

On the other hand, the Report seems to confuse the means of family limitation with the motives which inspire the use of these means. Thus, under the sub-title: "A Fundamental Adjustment", it says:

Throughout the period of falling family size, the birth-rate fluctuated in response to the trade cycle and to war; and the average size of family was no doubt influenced by changes, e.g. in the facilities for enjoyment of family life, the costs of children, and so on, that increased or diminished the attractions of parenthood. But through all fluctuations and diversity of circumstance, the spread of the small family persisted; individual couples, with change of circumstance or outlook, may have decided for or against having any specific number of children, but the movement towards the small family was not affected. This gradual permeation of the small family system through nearly all classes has to be regarded, we think, as a fundamental adjustment to modern conditions. The most significant feature of this adjustment, in our view, is the gradual acceptance of control over the size of one's family particularly by means of contraception as a normal part of personal responsibility. We are not concerned at this point with whether family limitation is or is not in the national interest, or whether motives are selfish or unselfish, but only with the fact of this acceptance of birth control and its bearing on the spread of the small family system. The widespread practice of birth control is undoubted, and our survey of causes suggests that, although the extent and efficiency of its practice may vary, no changes in the social environment are likely to lead men and women to abandon this means of control over their circumstances. This fundamental—and momentous—adjustment to modern life has to be accepted as the starting point for consideration of the probable future trend of population.¹

This is merely saying that there is no doubt about the means which are used to limit the size of families. It does not deal with the motives which prompt the use of these means.

In considering the size of the family in relation to the general

being broken down. The widespread adoption of family limitation in the 1870's, in our view, was due to the cumulative effect of these circumstances and to the special jolts which the depression of 1875 onwards and the Bradlaugh-Besant trials of 1877-78 gave to public opinion." (*Report*, para. 104, p. 41.)

¹ *Report*, para. 110, pp. 43-44.

well-being of society, the Report sets out very fully the advantages and disadvantages of an expanding, a stable, and a shrinking population, and argues that the stable population is the most suitable economic foundation for a generally good standard of life. It is not necessary here to enlarge on the serious economic and social consequences which would follow a decrease in the population due to a falling birth-rate. They have been very fully discussed in Mr W. B. Reddaway's book, *The Economics of a Declining Population*.¹ It will be sufficient to point out that, in face of the urgent need for greater production and the most efficient use of the country's man-power, we are already suffering from the evil consequences of family limitation over the past forty years. The following table gives, in thousands, the size of the male population in this country in five-year age-groups, in 1946:

Age Group	Male population, 1946 (thousands)
0-4 . . .	1,669
5-9 . . .	1,439
10-14 . . .	1,400
15-19 . . .	1,477
20-24 . . .	1,567
25-29 . . .	1,577
30-34 . . .	1,673
35-39 . . .	1,721
40-44 . . .	1,638
45-49 . . .	1,393
50-54 . . .	1,194
55-59 . . .	1,096
60-64 . . .	941

It will be seen from this table that, apart from the slight recovery of the last few years, each age group up to the age of 39

¹ They have been summarized by Mark Abrams in *The Population of Great Britain*, published for the London Press Exchange, Ltd., by Allen and Unwin; and in the present writer's *The Family and the Future* (C.S.G. 15.).

was substantially smaller than the next older group. The highest total is found in the 35-39 group, with 1,721,000 men. This group is among the most important and active in commerce and industry, and, with the present structure of our population, it will be impossible for that group to maintain its numbers for at least another forty years. Here is, perhaps, the core of our production and man-power problem. For forty years labour will be in increasingly short supply, and the country's man-power will be shrinking, just when it ought to be expanding.¹

The Report consequently urges a policy of replacement, or, in other words, a sufficiently high birth-rate to ensure a stable population. How this is to be achieved requires closer consideration.

Some years ago, through the work of Dr R. R. Kuczynski, a means of assessing population trends was arrived at, which was claimed to be statistically reliable. It was known as the Net Reproduction Rate.² This rate is, in fact, the ratio of potential mothers in the next generation to the mothers of the present generation, and can be obtained by taking account only of female births. It shows how many girl-babies will, on the average, be born to each female of child-bearing age in this generation, if the present fertility and mortality rates remain unchanged. A Net Reproduction Rate of one would mean that the mothers of this generation will be replaced by the same numbers of mothers a generation hence, and a continued N.R.R. of one would mean, of course, an eventually stable population. A N.R.R. of less than one would mean, on the other hand, that unless a change takes place fairly rapidly, the population will begin to decline.

The value of the N.R.R. as an indication of the future trend of the population has been called in question since the War. It has been shown that this rate, to be truly indicative, supposes

¹ This forecast is fully borne out by the *Estimates of the Sex and Age-Distribution of the Civil Population at 31st December, 1947*, recently published by the General Registry Office (His Majesty's Stationery Office, 2s. 6d.). Thus, where, in 1946, the 35-39 age group of the male population was given as 1,721,000, the 1947 estimate gives 1,663,000. Similarly, the respective figures for the 30-34 age group are 1,673,000 and 1,533,000. On the other hand, the 70-74 age group has increased from 566,000 to 586,000, and the 80-84 age group from 143,000 to 154,000. We are, in fact, an ageing population, the average age for the country having increased from 27 in 1891 to 35 in 1947.

² See Kuczynski, *Fertility and Reproduction and The Measurement of Population Growth*. See also D. V. Glass, *Population Policies and Movements*.

the same average marriage-rate in the two generations which are being compared. Since the War, there has been a spate of early marriages and, as a consequence, a very marked increase in the birth-rate. Thus, for example, while in 1941 the birth-rate was 13.9 per 1000, it rose in 1944 to 17.5, in 1946 to 19.1, and in 1947 to 20.5. This suggests that the situation is not quite so grave as some of the demographers have made out. The Royal Commission, however, are not greatly impressed by the calculation of Net Reproduction Rates. They are more concerned with the average size of the family, which they consider will give a truer indication of the trend of the population. There is no evidence, it is maintained, that the average size of the family is in any way increasing. The rise in the birth-rate and in the N.R.R. has been due merely to a combination of postponed marriages due to war conditions, and of early marriages following on the cessation of hostilities. More children have been born, it is true, but the ratio of children to parents has not substantially changed. This, of course, leads to the question: What is the average replacement-size family?

In the first place, it is difficult to find out the average size of the present-day family. The Report has a long, complicated, and somewhat inconclusive argument, based on "cohorts of families" (pp. 51-56), suggesting that the present size is about 2.16 children per family. This figure, a little later in the Report (p. 62) suddenly becomes 2.2, and it is suggested (p. 63), that the present average size of family in Great Britain is about six per cent below replacement level.¹

It is worth remarking, on the other hand, that a comparison of the ratio of births to marriages with the N.R.R. suggests that a family size of 2.5 or 2.6 children is necessary for replacement. For example, in 1923 the ratio of births to marriages for the country as a whole was 2.59, and in that year the N.R.R. was reckoned to be 1. In 1937 the ratio was 1.72, when the N.R.R. was 0.78, and in 1944 the ratio was 2.48, when the N.R.R. was 0.996.

In this connexion it may be useful to say something about

¹ These figures have been challenged by Mr R. F. Harrod in an article entitled "The Population Report", in *Soundings*, August 1949. He suggests that the number of children in the average family may be as low as 1.93.

the average size of Catholic families. In *The Tablet*, January and February, 1938, Mr E. Roper Power published a series of articles entitled "Population Prospects". In these he attempted to assess the Catholic ratio of baptisms to marriages, and therefore to indicate the size of the average Catholic family. In 1923 (a critical year in our population history, since, during that year, the N.R.R. descended below unity), the national ratio of births to marriages was 2.59, while the Catholic ratio of births to marriages was 3.39. In 1933, when the national ratio was 1.82, the Catholic ratio had fallen to 2.55, and in 1939 it had declined to 2.31. These figures suggest that the size of the average Catholic family went below replacement level about 1934 and, although there has been a considerable post-war increase (2.39 in 1946, 2.41 in 1947), there must be some doubt as to whether the Catholic body in this country, apart from immigration, is reproducing itself. This is clearly a very grave matter, not merely from the moral point of view in the decisions which are taken by individual Catholic parents, but also in relation to public policy on such serious matters as future church building, the extension of Catholic schools, and the prospect of vocations to the priesthood and the religious life.

From a survey of the contents of the Report it may be worth while to pass to comments and criticisms. In the first place, it must be admitted that the Report has certain qualities. It has been described, somewhat flatteringly, as "a document of wisdom and humanity". A better description might be "painstaking, thorough, but limited". From one point of view it has great value, since it focuses attention on the problem of family life and the protection of the family in modern society. In the material order it makes valuable suggestions with regard to home helps, child minders and sitters-in, and descends to such mundane, but nevertheless important, details as washing, ironing, and mending. It makes useful suggestions with regard to family holidays, and holidays for mothers. It deals with the planning of houses and with the complications of priorities, rent subsidies, family allowances, maternity costs, and income-tax relief.

On the other hand, the Report has serious defects. It might be argued that, in a general way, it quite fails to fulfil the terms

of reference given by royal warrant to the Commissioners. They were instructed "to examine the facts relating to the present population trends in Great Britain", yet, as has been pointed out, the most important fact, the present average size of a family in this country, is not ascertained, and the conclusion which is arrived at is open to serious objection. The Commission were also instructed "to investigate the causes of these trends", yet, although they go to considerable lengths in analysing the complex causes which have resulted in family limitation, they fail to appreciate that the materialist outlook of the present day, and the exclusion of the spiritual element in personal and family life, and particularly in parenthood, deprives the Report in this respect of any truly convincing value. Again, the Commissioners were instructed "to consider what measures, if any, should be taken, in the national interest, to influence the future trend of population". They agree that there must be an increase in the average size of the family, and then, quite illogically, proceed to recommend that an extension of facilities concerning knowledge and use of contraceptives should be encouraged by the authorities.

It might be considered pettifogging to note that, in places, the Report is obscure, prolix, and given to tautology.¹ It may be merely masculine prejudice to see in the Report the influence of the female, rather than the male, outlook, and to sense in it the attitude and viewpoint of the "emancipated woman".²

More serious, however, is the fact that the Report raises moral and religious questions, and also aims at settling them in a way which is outside its scope and beyond its terms of reference. For example, it passes judgement, lightly and almost airily, on one of the gravest issues of our day: the morality of artificial contraception, which it discusses under the euphemistic title of "Voluntary Parenthood". It makes no attempt to discuss the moral issue, and gives what one can only assume to be a travesty of the Catholic evidence on this point. It is more con-

¹ E.g. it does not appear necessary to say that "The growth in the number of young married couples has taken place because people are marrying earlier," or that "If, in one of the two sections into which we have divided population, family size is now higher than pre-war, and in the population as a whole it is slightly less, in the other section it must be lower."

² Seven of the original sixteen Commissioners were women, and there were six among the fourteen Commissioners who signed the Report.

cerned with the physical and psychological effects than with the moral issue. Two paragraphs must be quoted in full:

We agree with the view that there is nothing inherently wrong in the use of mechanical methods of contraception. Our survey of the history of family limitation leaves us in no doubt that, if these methods were not available, other means would be used, and some of them, e.g. criminal abortion, the prevalence of which is even now distressingly high, are very undesirable. There is no prospect that men and women, having acquired control over the numbers of children they will have, will abandon it. Nor is it desirable that they should. The spread of contraceptive knowledge represents a big extension of man's control over his circumstances. As such it brings many problems with it. But it has been one of the conditions of the great social advances that have been made since the nineteenth century; it has made possible for increasing numbers of people the planning of the size of their families, and has helped to free women from excessive burdens and to ensure that more and more of the children born are wanted children. Control by men and women over the numbers of their children is one of the first conditions of their own and the community's welfare, and in our view mechanical and chemical methods of contraception have to be accepted as part of the modern means, however imperfect, by which it can be exercised.

We contemplate therefore that, with the spread of effective knowledge of contraception, voluntary parenthood will become more or less universal. This will accelerate the fall in the numbers of the larger families except among those who deliberately decide to have them; but it will help to secure that children, whether in large or small families, are wanted children and not the result of ignorance.¹

It has been pointed out that the arguments here adduced, and the attitude of mind reflected, might well produce a similar statement to justify the practice of abortion.

Strangely enough, the Report says practically nothing on the question of divorce, yet everybody is aware that the enormous increase in the number of divorces in this country is probably the biggest factor involved in the disintegration of family life. In 1913 there were 300 divorces in Great Britain; thirty years

¹ Paras. 427-8, p. 159.

later there were 9999, and the figure has climbed steadily, so that in 1947 the number of dissolved or annulled marriages was over 60,000.

With regard to religion, the references in the Report are either vague or disquieting. Apart from a statement (page 212), that "Outside the schools, the co-operation of the churches and voluntary organizations would be essential" to obtain an extension of sex education, of the practical crafts of home-making, and the development of special courses in the psychological aspects of marriage, there are only two specific references to religion, and these are concerned with the problem of immigration and assimilation. What is suggested by the references must be very distasteful to the Catholic reader. The Report points out that "... there may be continuing pressure to bring in immigrants to make good shortages in particular occupations". They regard this prospect as undesirable, since, among other things, "the sources of supply of suitable immigrants are meagre, and the capacity of a fully established society like ours to absorb immigrants of alien race and religion is limited".¹

This clearly secular outlook is the Report's worst characteristic. It treats marriage, parenthood, and child-bearing as part of a biological process. As Dr Fairfield has said elsewhere, it regards married people as two individuals to whom, by an accident of biology, a third may become attached. It has no appreciation of the continuing life of a family in its traditions from generation to generation, and of the importance, for instance, of grandparents, who have been neatly described as the "cement of the family". So far as morals are concerned, the Report would need little or no alteration if it were dealing with stock-breeding rather than with human persons and families.

¹ Para. 648, p. 225. The anti-Catholic implication is stronger in para. 329, p. 124: "Immigration on a large scale into a fully established society like ours could only be welcomed without reserve if the immigrants were of good human stock and were not prevented by their religion or race from intermarrying with the host population and becoming merged in it. These conditions were fulfilled by intermittent large scale immigration in the past, notably by the Flemish and French Protestant refugees who settled in Great Britain at different times. There is little or no prospect that we should be able to apply these conditions to large scale immigration in the future, and every increase of our needs, e.g. by more emigration from Great Britain or by a further fall in fertility, would tend to lower the standards of selection."

As with most Reports of Royal Commissions, this document will very probably become the basis of future legislation. In one respect it will raise the gravest problems for Catholic nurses and doctors. In demanding an extension of facilities for contraceptive advice, it lays the initial duty on the family doctor, and it goes on to suggest that, if he objects, on religious or other grounds, his patients will be directed to leave him and to seek the advice they require from other doctors, not hampered by such conscientious principles.¹

It will be the duty of Catholic doctors, with the support of the clergy, to resist, in its very beginnings, any movement to implement this suggestion in the Report.

Finally, from the general Catholic point of view, we have an important duty to resist the pressure of sheer materialism which surrounds us. This is perhaps a much more erosive and subtle form of undermining the Catholic life than any open persecution. It can be resisted only by a strong personal, spiritual life, with a spiritual outlook, in which the practice of and respect for poverty have their place, in which mortification and suffering (related clearly to the redemptive work of the Crucifixion) have a part, and in which the spiritual riches of parenthood are recognized and appreciated. Above all we must appreciate and preach the graces which husband and wife receive in the sacrament of Matrimony. All this must go hand-in-hand with an intense desire for the achievement of social justice, and an attitude of mind which will judge every proposal for legislation or regulation in the social order by the effect it has on the dignity and integrity of family life. In all this the clergy have obviously a very important part to play.

✠ GEORGE ANDREW,
Bishop of Tigua

¹ Paras. 536-7-8, p. 194.

RICHARD CRASHAW (DIED 1649)

SPOONER, who was Warden of New College at the beginning of the century—a man known to fame, but unjustly, for I believe he never in his life perpetrated a Spoonerism—was once asked whether there was much Christian Socialism in Oxford. His reply was, "No, I shouldn't say there was much; in fact, I think there are only two Christian Socialists in Oxford, Dr Rashdall and myself." (Dr Rashdall, afterwards Dean of Carlisle, was a clerical Fellow of New College.) "Only Dr Rashdall and myself; and I'm not very much of a Socialist, and Dr Rashdall isn't *very* much of a Christian." In the same way, if you asked a rather forgetful person whether there were any great religious poets in England during the first half of the seventeenth century, he would be apt to reply, "Only two, Donne and Herbert; and Herbert wasn't a very great poet, and Donne wasn't very religious." Then, after a moment's pause, he would add, "Oh, I'd forgotten Crashaw."

Comparisons are odious, but they are also illuminating. Donne, Herbert and Crashaw form a remarkable triad; nor is the number complete—Herrick, too, was a poet of that age, and Herrick, like the others, was a clergyman. Herbert was unquestionably a religious man, but I don't think he was more than a moderate poet. What appeals to us in Herbert is quaintness, rather than grandeur. Donne was a great poet, greater, perhaps, than Crashaw, but I don't think he was, fundamentally, a religious man. Herrick is questionable on both grounds. You may, nevertheless, think him a religious man and a great poet into the bargain. But even so, I would not class him with Crashaw. His fame depends chiefly on what he himself called his "unbaptized numbers"; and even his devotional writings lack depth. Whereas Crashaw's poetry was all religion, and Crashaw's religion was all poetry. Unlike Donne, unlike Herrick, he is fully integrated.

Let me amplify that a little, or I may seem to be dismissing great names too summarily. You can't help liking George Herbert, even if your appreciation only takes the form of thinking he was a dear old gentleman. (Actually he was forty when he died.) But he is one of your safe candidates; he takes no risks,

he doesn't aspire to the heights. Of his piety there is no question, and sometimes he rings the bell by achieving a happy phrase, polished and quotable. But you don't (at least *I* don't) come across things in his works which make you say to yourself aloud, "By Gad, that's good!" Herrick has a cleverness which sometimes makes him run with Crashaw for the length of an epigram, but when all is said and done, he has very little to tell us about religion. It would be too harsh to say that he was only a parson on Sundays, but the *Hesperides* do outnumber the *Noble Numbers* by five to one; he is such a humanist, so easily distracted by every trivial thought which comes along, that you do not really picture him as a man of prayer. With Donne the case is worse; he is a man morbidly preoccupied with sex. No, not just the comfortable grossness of the Jacobean age; I am sure Donne's psyche was all wrong—look at that extraordinary poem about he flea! To be sure, he was a theologian; he has been called the last of the Schoolmen; and I suppose that is why Johnson, so inappropriately, labelled this whole group of poets "metaphysical". But (to my mind) he writes of sacred subjects with a marble detachment; how complimentary he is to the Virgins in his Litany! Turn from that to his essay on Virginity, and it makes a hypocrite of him at once. With Donne, as with Milton, you feel that he was a man much interested in religion, but not a religious man.

With Crashaw, it is just the other way; we really know nothing about him, except what belongs to a religious context. The story of his life can be told in a sentence; that he was a much-loved Fellow of Peterhouse, the friend of Cowley; that he was ejected by the Puritans, became a Catholic, went abroad, was given a minor benefice at Loreto, and died there when he had been in enjoyment of it for a few weeks. Turn to his writings to fill out the picture, and you will find that he only produced about fifty poems on secular subjects, and ten of these were epitaphs; the man who aspired to live a dying life has bequeathed to us a thanatography, rather than a biography. There is nothing about love-affairs, nothing about quarrels, nothing about pets, nothing about May-day revelry or hay-making or getting drunk; the whole stock-in-trade of his literary contemporaries seems to have passed him by.

The anonymous preface to the first edition of *Steps to the Temple* has seized upon this characteristic, and perhaps made too much of it. "It were profane," says this unknown editor, "but to mention here in the preface those under-headed poets, retainers to seven shares and a half, whose only business in verse is to rhyme a poor sixpenny soul, a suburb sinner, into hell. . . ." (I have no idea what those phrases mean.) "Oh, when the general arraignment of poets shall be . . . with what a triumphant brow shall our poet sit above, and look down upon poor Homer, Virgil, Horace, Claudian, etc.; who had amongst them the ill luck to talk out a great part of their gallant genius upon bees, dung, frogs, and gnats, etc., and not as himself here, upon scriptures, divine graces, martyrs and angels!" This might seem to suggest that Crashaw was a Puritan or an exquisite, who turned away from base subjects as unworthy of him. I doubt if it was that; I think he simply hadn't the itch to write a poem about everything he came across. Imagine the four poets going for a walk together and passing, say, a scare-crow. Donne would have been reminded of his classics; let us hope that he would have remained silent. Herrick would have turned out some graceful little couplet that didn't get you anywhere, as, for instance:

Look, Stranger, on this Scar-crow! And see what
Panique he spreads on all sides, having my hat.

George Herbert would have thought out a longish poem on obvious lines, about the Cross scaring away Divells. But I don't think it would have occurred to Crashaw that there was anything to write about. He was too introverted, I suspect, to have his themes forced upon him by outward encounter.

What was it, then, that set Crashaw a-rhyming? Undoubtedly, I think, the influence of the Latin classics. When we have given up reading the classics altogether, in forty or fifty years' time, I do not see how people will begin to understand the nature or the inspiration of Jacobean poetry. Shut your eyes, and imagine yourself in a library that has its basis, as a library should, in the well-printed, well-bound editions of the early seventeenth century. What are the names that leap to your mind? Ovid, yes, and Martial. Lose sight of those two, and the tech-

nique of Jacobean poetry becomes, at once, unintelligible. Let me indulge in a few generalizations, obvious enough, and incomplete as generalizations always are. The genius of the Latin language is capable of being developed in two different directions. There is the sonorous, rhetorical tradition of Cicero and Virgil. There is the concentrated, epigrammatic tradition of Tacitus and Martial. The latter is the inspiration of the Jacobeans, with their intense verbal cleverness, their allusive silences, their striving after paradox. The other, the rhetorical tradition, was Milton's choice; Virgil was his parent, or if you will his grandparent, with Dante as the intervening generation. His choice won; Dryden and Pope carried on the Virgilian tradition, though with a slight difference which is, in a way, the analogue of Lucan. Lucan, with his "victrix causa deis placuit, sed victa Catoni", his "nil actum credens, dum quid superesset agendum"; it is Virgil, but more formalized, more neatly tied up at the edges. And what Lucan did to Virgil, Dryden, in a way, did to Milton. It was Latin in the grand manner; they had left behind them the mere cleverness, and the somewhat crabbed restraint, of Tacitus and Martial and the Jacobeans.

Tacitus and Martial, I say, but the discoverer of the vein was Ovid. It was from Ovid, surely, that they learned their love of conceits; of singling out one incongruous feature in a situation, and either throwing it into violent relief by the shock tactics of an epigram, or else worrying it slowly to death under a series of alternative images. An excellent example of the latter method is to be found in Crashaw's *Invitation*, addressed to Lady Denbigh when she could not quite make up her mind to become a Catholic. The incongruity of the situation, familiar to all who have been through the experience, is that you reach a point at which your mind is convinced but your will remains irresolute. That is Crashaw's opportunity:

What magic bolts, what mystic bars
Maintain the will in these strange wars?
What fatal yet fantastic bands
Keep the free heart from its own hands?
So, when the year takes cold, we see
Poor waters their own prisoners be;

Fettered, and locked up fast they lie
 In a sad self-captivity;
 The astonished nymphs their flood's strange fate deplore,
 To see themselves their own severer shore.

How Ovidian that poem is, I have reason to know, because I amused myself by turning the whole of it into elegiacs thirty years ago, when I was in the Countess of Denbigh's position myself. You do not really understand a poem until you have turned it into Latin verse. And this one, believe me, simply *fell* into the Ovidian formula.

But Crashaw's first efforts were based on Martial, not on Ovid. His *Epigrammata Sacra* were printed by the Cambridge University Press in 1634; it was the only one of his books he ever saw through the press himself; the rest were published for him by friends when he was already in exile. Here you have a Fellow of Peterhouse, whose mind is saturated, as the minds of dons were in those happier days, with the classics. He is, besides, a man of deep religious feeling. He is inclined to model himself on George Herbert, a friend, like himself, of the Little Gidding circle, for whom he has a profound admiration. (*The Temple* appeared in the year immediately before *Epigrammata Sacra*.) As he thumbs his gospels, and meditates on them, Crashaw gets certain "lights" as we all do; he seizes, for the first time, the full point of some utterance of our Lord's, notices, for the first time, some happy coincidence which links this occurrence, undesignedly, with that. The ordinary Christian's instinct is to make a note of the circumstance in some commonplace book, some journal of retreat; the ordinary clergyman's instinct is to lay it up as the text for a sermon. Crashaw's instinct is somewhat different. He crystallizes his thought in the form of an English, or more probably of a Latin, epigram.

Do not be too ready to exclaim at the cold-bloodedness of the proceeding. The man, remember, thinks as easily in Latin as in English; cannot be sure, until he turns back and questions his own thought, whether he is thinking in Latin or in English. Many of the sacred epigrams were printed in both languages, and it is an amusing game to speculate, in any given case, which form was the original. An amusing game, but I don't think you

will often find yourself able to pronounce with certainty. And remember that paradox, to the Christian thinker, is not an intellectual exercise, far-fetched, cultivated with laborious ingenuity. It is a sort of open-cast mining, to look for paradox in the gospels. After all, if the thing is true; if God did lie in a stable, if the Eternal did die on a Cross, the paradox is there, hitting you in the eye—you cannot get away from it. Or again, if you live in a fallen world with a fallen nature, perpetually in love with a moral ideal which you find yourself incapable of achieving, it does not need a Crashaw to find paradox in the situation; St Paul himself will tell you, "What I do is not what I wish to do, but something which I hate." *Odi et amo*—it takes you straight back to Catullus.

The patentee of commenting on the gospels by epigram is St Augustine. He had inherited, through Tertullian, the tradition of prose-fireworks which came down from Tacitus, and there was no word he commented on but might set him off on a full tide of paradox. Listen to him on the word *fatigatus*, when our Lord sits down wearied at the well of Samaria. "Not for nothing is he wearied, he, who is God's strength; not for nothing is he wearied, he, who gives the weary rest; not for nothing is he wearied, he, whose absence makes us so feeble, whose presence makes us so strong. . . . Christ's power it was that created thee; it needed Christ's weakness to re-create thee." Notice the pun on the word "recreation"; it is characteristic of the style. "Through Christ's power, the nothing thou wast came to be; but for Christ's weakness, the being thou hadst had passed into nothing. His power fashioned us; it was his weakness that came to find us, when we were lost." All that (and much more) is St Augustine's commentary on one word. And must Crashaw never let himself go, when the same opportunity lay before him?

He did let himself go; not on any principle, it would seem, but whenever a point happened to strike him. Take, as a sample of this style, what was perhaps the best poem he wrote in this style, his well-known epigram on the Widow's Mite. The *Epigrammata Sacra*, as they were published in 1634, were all in Latin; let us be content with the English version which he published later—and perhaps composed earlier.

Two mites, two drops—yet all her house and land—
 Fall from a steady heart, though trembling hand;
 The other's wanton wealth foams high and brave;
 The other cast away, she only gave.

That is as good an epigram as you would get anywhere; yet, observe, it does not go a step beyond our Lord's own meaning. It only elaborates the contrast. If that is so (we are tempted to ask), why not be content with our Lord's own words? The objection is ill found; to have restated the meaning of a gospel passage first in your own Latin, then in your own English, is in a sense to have mastered it. The artist cannot be content with gazing at the face he loves, he must paint a portrait of it, to make it his own; so your poet, whose trade is in words, must translate the admired sentiment into his own language, so as to get outside it. Gospel text, and Crashaw's Latin, and Crashaw's English; here is a threefold lock, to keep the treasure safe, like those old chests that could only be opened by the rector and both the churchwardens. Or is that fanciful? Have I been reading too much George Herbert?

That, surely, was the genesis of the *Epigrammata Sacra*; they are merely Crashaw rising from his knees in soliloquy. I dare swear that the Fellows of Peterhouse had plenty of ado to make him publish. The preface indicates that his friends had been prepared to underwrite the success of the book at their own risk. It also contains a very curious hint that the Jesuits will not be too pleased at its publication; it is very difficult to see why they should have minded. These are the qualms of self-consciousness; in downright fact there was little reason why anybody should have regretted the appearance of the book, or for that matter vociferously welcomed it. The formula becomes almost monotonous; echoes of the Augustinian paradox are ingeniously awoken at each successive stage of our Lord's life. You read the lesson of Bethlehem in the words, *Illi non locus est, quo sine nec locus est*; "Space is none for him, without whom space could not be." The apostles called away from their nets are fish in Christ's net now; *Una salus nobis est potuisse capi*; "Caught we must contrive to be, or there is no escaping." The withered fig-tree congratulates itself, *Non possum autumnu nobiliore frui*; "Never was an

autumn brought such glory with it." Even more Augustinian is the comment on our Lord's silence before His judges: *Ille olim verbum qui dixit, et omnia fecit, verbum non dicens omnia nunc reficit.* Crashaw's own translation, not quite so happy, is:

O mighty nothing, unto thee,
Nothing, we owe all things that be.
God spoke once when he all things made,
He saved all when he nothing said!
The world was made of nothing then;
'Tis made by nothing now again.

That is the formula of the thing; Martial Christianized.

Already you may trace the symptoms of that over-subtlety, that straining after paradox, which was Crashaw's danger. It wasn't really necessary to make a sick man address St Peter in the words, "Thy shadow's shadow shall be my light." On the other hand, Crashaw in his early manner is sometimes simple almost to the verge of tameness, as in the well-known lines on the "sepulchre in which man was never yet laid":

How life and death in thee
Agree!
Thou hadst a Virgin womb
And tomb.
A Joseph did betroth
Them both.

Herbert could have written that; and indeed, if the authorship were doubtful, I think it would be attributed to Herbert. But, simple or complicated, the work which Crashaw published in 1634 gave no definite promise that he would be a poet. Rather, an agile scholar who could Latinize for you gracefully, as dons did know how to Latinize before we invented the word "research". He would define the following of Christ as *ire in bonam crucem* without once looking round to see if you caught his allusion. Moreover, where religion was concerned, he had the seeing eye; he could pick out for you the vein of tragic irony that runs through the gospels. But, a great poet? Hardly that! If he had

died fifteen years earlier he would have been, at best, a legend of the combination-room.

When was it, then, and under what stimulus, that Crashaw became a poet? The simplest answer, perhaps, is that he never did. Not, I mean, in the sense of intending to be a poet, or even wanting to be a poet; not in the sense of writing poetry for poetry's sake. The mood only took him occasionally. When his friends died, he wrote epitaphs about them. When anything happened at Court—the birth of a new baby, for example—he celebrated it in the overdone manner of his time. On much rarer, all too rare occasions, he got up from his knees and sang to God.

It was in 1646, when he was already in exile, and only three years before he died, that an admiring friend brought out two volumes in one, *Steps to the Temple* and *The Delights of the Muses*. It was not complete; did not contain, for example, the letter to the Countess of Denbigh, or the second hymn to St Theresa. But it contained the bulk of his work, and the bulk was—what? Only some hundred and thirty pages in a generously spaced edition. It is hardly the length of Gray, unquestionably the idlest of our poets. Not a large output, really, for a man of thirty-six or thirty-seven, who had enjoyed, till he was thirty, what was then the delicious retirement of a Cambridge combination-room. He could have written more, surely, if he had set his mind to it. . . . But I don't think he ever did set his mind to it. His mind was elsewhere.

We will dismiss his court poems with short comment; a glance is enough. They will prepare us for the fact, which is evident in far more serious contexts, that Crashaw had not much gift of self-criticism. For the most part, he prudently took refuge in Latin; and I am afraid that, unless Henrietta Maria was something of a Latinist, his addresses will have passed unread by the addressee. But when he ventures on the expression of his loyalty in English, he does badly where no English poet has ever done well. Scriblerus might have quoted, or invented, one of his couplets:

War, Blood, and Death (names all averse from joy)
Hear this! We have another bright-eyed Boy!

The sequel to it is even more painful :

Then let the eastern world brag and be proud
Of one coy Phoenix, while we have a brood,
A brood of phoenixes ; while we have brother
And sister phoenixes, and still the mother !
And may we long ; long mayst thou live, to increase
The house and family of phoenixes.

It is unbelievable, but alas, it is textual.

Of the epitaphs, one stands in a class by itself, that on the Husband and Wife who died together ; it is in the anthologies. "Let them sleep on, let them sleep on, Till this stormy night be gone"—that has the authentic effect of the very finest poetry, of making you catch your breath without being able to understand why it has happened. The rest are well enough, but there is nothing to single them out as remarkable in that age of industrious tomb-building. Perhaps the best is a short one, on his old school-master, Dr Brooke, nearly spoilt, but not quite, by its quaintness.

A Brooke, whose stream, so great, so good
Was loved, was honoured as a Flood,
Whose banks the Muses dwelt upon
More than their own Helicon,
Here at length hath gladly found
A quiet passage underground ;
Meanwhile his loved banks, now dry
The Muses with their tears supply.

But all through the *Delights of the Muses*, neither author nor reader is fully at ease. You have the overmastering impression that it is Thalia's day out ; Urania has come in to oblige, but she knows and you know that it is not "her place". Crashaw always exaggerates his images ; that is all very well in a religious context, where the supernatural impinges on the natural plane. But it strikes a false note in the secular poems, even in the most serious of them. Bishop Andrewes, to be sure, was a very great man, and when you stand before his portrait you may, if you will, describe it as a shadow cast by a setting sun ; that is a fine notion. But you must not go on to say that Bishop Andrewes's death "left the dim face of this dull hemisphere all one great

eye, all drowned in one great tear"—you are getting too far away from the facts. Of course, one poem in this collection was destined to represent Crashaw in all the anthologies, the lines to his Supposed Mistress. But, however beautiful, surely they are something of a *tour de force*? It is like Trollope killing Mrs Proudie; you feel somebody had bet him that he couldn't do it.

It may be interpreted, still more significantly, as a gesture; a gesture of celibacy. It was an age of courtly love, by which I mean that you cannot imagine Herrick referring to his girl friend. And Crashaw would relegate the Lucastas and Antheas of contemporary literature, once for all, to the realm of the imaginary. I take for genuine the sentiment of his epigram on Marriage:

I would be married, but I'd have no wife—
I would be married to a single life.

After all, there is not much point in it if it simply means that, as the Fellow of a College, Crashaw had a preference for remaining a bachelor. "Married" surely means "vowed" to a single life; the amorous feelings which Herrick distributed among so many putative milk-maids should, for Crashaw, be sublimated into the love of God. It is conceivable that the Mrs. M. R. to whom the prayer-book was sent was something more than a mere acquaintance. It was an age of spiritual affinities; the seventeenth century was inspired, at its opening, by the holy association between St Francis of Sales and St Jane Frances of Chantal; was disenchanted of that ideal, only at its close, by the antics of Madame Guyon and Père Lacombe. But there is no valid reason why we should suspect, in Crashaw, even that amount of condescension to human weakness. The she-saints of Christendom were his romance; most noticeably St Mary Magdalen, a common devotion in the seventeenth century, and St Theresa of Avila, only just canonized, appealing to her age much as her namesake of Lisieux appeals to our own.

You will see what I am getting at. If Crashaw wrote little, if what he wrote was but little castigated, it was because he was, first and foremost, an ascetic, unmoved by the thought of literary fame. The anonymous editor of 1646 describes him as "leading his life in St Mary's church near St Peter's College . . .

where, like a primitive saint, he offered more prayers in the night than others usually offer in the day." Father Miles Pinkney, who edited, in 1652, the collection of his works called *Carmen Deo Nostro*, tells us how Crashaw "Was beloved by all, dispraised by none. . . . Nor would he give nor take offence, befall what might; he would possess himself, . . . forestalled with heavenly riches, which had wholly called his thoughts from earth. . . . What he might eat or wear he took no thought; his needful food he rather found than sought" and so on; the whole preface is not an appreciation, it is a hagiography. And Cowley, as we know, did not shrink from using the word "saint" in recalling his memory:

Poet and saint! To thee alone are given
The two most sacred names of earth and heaven;
The hard and rarest union which can be
Next that of Godhead with Humanity . . .

I think Cowley is right there, and Bremond wrong. And, lower down:

His faith, perhaps, in some nice tenets might
Be wrong; his life, I'm sure, was in the right;
And I myself a Catholic will be
So far at least, great saint, to pray to thee!

Even making allowances for the encomiastic fashion of the day, these are no ordinary tributes. To the people who really knew him, Crashaw was not just a pious sort of poet. He was a holy man who wrote verses.

So much is a plain matter of history; the further suggestion I want to make is a matter of guess-work. I believe the real fact about Crashaw is, that he was a mystic. Not in the sense of a man who writes esoteric poetry, as Vaughan did, and Traherne. A mystic, as such, does not write poetry; he has better things to do. He is a man whose prayer aspires to get rid not of words merely, but of thoughts; to pass, even, beyond any conscious acts of the will, and to repose in God by some other faculty for which we have no name, that touches somehow, and more immediately, the Divine.

It was the atmosphere of contemporary France. In Spain,

the great age of mysticism was the sixteenth century, the period of St Theresa and St John of the Cross. In France, it begins with St Francis of Sales and the fathers of the French Oratory; it flourishes in a hundred different coteries, whose history has been preserved to us in the great work of Abbé Bremond; with the condemnation of the *Maximes des Saints* in 1699 it suffers eclipse. That this movement had repercussions in England is certain; indeed, to some extent the writings of an English refugee, Father Benet Canfield, seem to have been responsible for inaugurating it. If Crashaw caught the infection, it is not likely to have been from his fellow-Anglicans, even at Little Gidding. But books were at his disposal; and it was natural that such an admirer of St Theresa should indoctrinate himself, somehow, with the tenets of mysticism.

O thou undaunted daughter of desires,
 By all thy dower of lights and fires,
 By all the eagle in thee, all the dove
 By all thy lives and deaths of love,
 By thy large draughts of intellectual day,
 And by thy thirsts of love more large than they . . .
 By all of him we have in thee
 Leave nothing of myself in me;
 Let me so read thy life, that I
 Unto all life of mine may die.

It was not probable that her poet would let the matter rest there, would be content with a mere literary appreciation of the thing she stood for.

In the dedication of the prayer-book to Mrs. M. R. he manifests the same attraction, referring to

that sacred store
 Of hidden sweets and holy joys,
 Words which are not heard with ears
 (Those tumultuous shops of noise),
 Effectual whispers, whose still voice
 The soul itself more feels than hears;
 Amorous languishments, luminous trances,
 Sightings which are not seen with eyes . . .
 Delicious deaths, soft exhalations
 Of soul, dear and divine annihilations . . .

And many a mystic thing
Which the divine embraces
Of the dear spouse of spirits with them will bring,
For which it is no shame
That dull mortality must not know a name.

Something you have there which George Herbert never wrote about. But it is in the Epiphany hymn that you get the clearest picture of Crashaw as a mystic; he refers by name to the Pseudo-Dionysius, a fifth-century author from whom the whole mystical tradition of the Church seems to derive; he alludes explicitly to that darkness, that suspension of the senses and the soul's faculties, which is the very condition of the Divine union. The "right-eyed Areopagite" is represented as deriving his inspiration from the darkness of the stable at Bethlehem:

Thus shall that reverend child of light,
By being first scholar of this new night,
Come forth great master of the mystic day,
And teach obscure mankind a more close way
(By the frugal, negative light
Of a most wise and well-abused night)
To read more legible thine original ray
And make our darkness serve thy day.

Had Crashaw handled, or did he only know by quotation, that strange mediaeval treatise, *The Cloud of Unknowing*, so faithful to the doctrine of the pseudo-Denys, so influential in forming the whole tradition of later mysticism?

Mystics do not write while they are praying—except Madame Guyon, who, I am afraid, was bogus. The reason is obvious; you can only write with images in your mind, and of such images your mystic, if he would pray, is the iconoclast. I would not, then, suggest that it made any difference to Crashaw's writing, what kind of prayer he used. But I think, if he was in the mystical tradition, it would explain one thing about his writing, his great want of self-criticism. To reflect, to turn back upon yourself, is the enemy of contemplation; it is to cloud the view of God with your own shadow. I see Crashaw, then, coming back from his prayer to his poetry with a great wealth of

images running through his brain—all the more tumultuously, perhaps, for their recent cold-shouldering. He plays round his theme untiringly, seeing it from a hundred angles, and each view must go down on paper. He is writing for St Mary Magdalen, for St Theresa, not for a set of critics who will read it over his shoulder and say, "This is good . . . that is bad". So you get the glorious second stanza of *The Weeper*:

Heavens thy fair eyes be,
Heavens of ever-falling stars;
'Tis seed-time still with thee,
And stars thou sowest, whose harvest dares
Promise the earth to countershine
Whatever makes heaven's forehead fine.

and lower down:

Not in the evening's eyes
When they red with weeping are
For the sun that dies,
Sits sorrow with a face so fair;
Nowhere but here did ever meet
Sweetness so sad, sadness so sweet.

Then, before you know where you are:

And now where he strays
Among the Galilean mountains,
Or more unwelcome ways,
He's followed by two faithful fountains;
Two walking baths, two weeping motions,
Portable, and compendious oceans.

Well, George Herbert can fall pretty flat; he it was that wrote "What can be lower than the common manger?" But there is no thud, because he falls from no great height. How could Crashaw, we ask, so forget himself? But you see, he *was* forgetting himself. He wasn't thinking about Richard Crashaw, he was thinking about Mary Magdalene.

How inexhaustible his fancy is! Some of his best work was done in the form of translation; and yet they are not really translations, *Dies irae*, *Stabat Mater*, *Vexilla Regis*, *Lauda Sion*,

Adoro te devote—they are all a kind of midrash; it is what Crashaw would have written, if Crashaw had been the author of the original. You get an excellent example of that in the lines:

Credo quidquid dixit Dei Filius;
Nil hoc verbo veritatis verius.

We have a translation of the *Adoro te* from the hand of a modern poet who has much in common with Crashaw, Gerard Manley Hopkins. And I do not know that you could better his rendering:

What God's Son hath told me, take for truth I do;
Truth itself speaks truly, or there's nothing true—

perfect English idiom, and yet it contains just what was in the original. Now watch Crashaw tackling the same couplet:

Faith is my force, faith strength affords
To keep pace with those powerful words;
And words more sure, more sweet than they,
Love could not think, truth could not say.

Excellent, but he could not be content to give a rendering of St Thomas, he must bring St Bonaventure in too. The words must be *sweet* as well as true; if it is truth that says them, it must nevertheless be *love* that thinks them. You cannot circumscribe such genius.

I have been writing about a Cambridge man who, if Antony a Wood's rather fishy story is to be trusted, went to Oxford before he went abroad, and became an Oxford man—and I have never rubbed it in. A man, too, who began life as a member of the Church of England, and became, instead, a member of the Church of Rome—and I have forgotten to rub that in either. I have only been concerned to interpret such a man as would have adorned, by his genius, any University, and by his holiness, any Church; and I would rather stand worshipping at his shrine, than make it a text for controversy.

R. A. KNOX

THE DECREE OF THE HOLY OFFICE
ON COMMUNISM

EARLY in July of this year the Holy Office, which ceased to be "news" when people stopped calling it the Inquisition and confusing it with Torquemada, re-captured the attention of the secular press with a decree on Communism.¹ Apparently unaware that the decree was the logical sequel to a series of papal pronouncements spread over a hundred years, the popular newspapers seized upon it as though it were a new and drastic move in the "Cold War", from the outbreak of which, in 1945, their own interest in Communism largely dates. Banner headlines announcing that the Pope had excommunicated Communists were followed by editorial suggestions that he had been persuaded (some implied that he had been stampeded) into taking a step which had hitherto been cannily avoided. The general implication was that the Holy Father, having despaired of the possibility of coming to terms with Communism, had crossed the Rubicon in advance of the Western Foreign Ministers and gone openly to war with it.

In actual fact, as a brief consideration of papal pronouncements and ecclesiastical law would have shown, the decree constitutes neither a new departure in papal policy, nor a new enactment on the part of the ecclesiastical legislator. It certainly involves no change in the official attitude of the Church to Communism. As far back as 9 November, 1846, a year before the publication of the Communist Manifesto, Pius IX listed "this infamous doctrine called Communism" among the principal dangers threatening the Catholic faith, and declared it to be "completely contrary to the natural law itself".² Three years later, about the time of the first communist-inspired risings, he classified the propagators of Communism with the "apostates and heretics" with whom Rome was swarming, and who "animated by a supreme hatred of Catholic truth" were trying by every means to spread their pestiferous doctrines.³ And shortly

¹ S.C.S. Off. Decretum, 1 July, 1949; *A.A.S.*, 1949, XLI, p. 334. Cf. *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, XXXII, 1949, p. 208.

² Enc. *Qui pluribus*; Gasparri, *Fontes*, n. 504, p. 811.

³ Alloc. *Quibus quantisque*, 20 April, 1849; *Fontes*, n. 507, pp. 831-2.

afterwards, in a letter to the Italian Bishops, he named the Communists as "the principal architects of this most criminal plot" which sought to overturn the whole existing order.¹ Moreover, though he was soon able to announce a diminution of the menace of revolutionary atheism,² he renewed all his previous condemnations of Communism in the *Syllabus Errorum* which he appended to his encyclical, *Quanta Cura*, of 8 December, 1864.³

The menace of the new doctrine continued to wane during the rest of the century, and, apart from a flare-up in the seventies which drew from Leo XIII a fresh warning against "this deadly plague"⁴ there was little need for the Church to re-state her position, until, with the Bolshevik revolution of 1917, the Communists seized power in Russia and, after a few years devoted to consolidating their position, were able to turn their attention to the outside world. Pius XI was not slow to read the signs. His first concern was to relieve the misery of the Russian people, but, in 1924, after the return of the papal relief-mission, he felt it to be his duty to call upon the governments of the world and all who loved peace and valued the sanctity of the family and the dignity of man, to unite in staving off what he described as this "most grave and certain danger".⁵ In 1928, he summoned the faithful to make reparation to the Sacred Heart for the persecutions which the Communists and their godless allies had already begun to wage against the Church.⁶ They might outwardly profess religious toleration, but, as he wrote in 1931, "their antagonism and open hostility to Holy Church and to God are but too well known and are proved by their deeds".⁷ And the following year, in an encyclical on the evils of our time, he insisted again on the anti-God character of the movement and declared: "It is therefore necessary that we too should unite all our forces in one solid line against the ranks of iniquity, which are no less hostile to God than to the human race. For in this fight the issue at stake is the greatest that human free will could be called upon to decide: for God, or against God, that,

¹ Ep. *Nostis et Nobiscum*, 5 Dec., 1849; *Fontes*, n. 508, p. 839.

² Alloc. *Singulari quadam*, 9 Dec., 1854; *Fontes*, n. 518, p. 892.

³ *Syllabus Errorum*, § IV; *Fontes*, n. 543, p. 1002.

⁴ Enc. *Quod apostolici*, 28 Dec., 1878; *Fontes*, n. 576, p. 125.

⁵ Alloc. *Nostis qua praecepit*, 18 Dec., 1924; *A.A.S.*, 1924, XVI, p. 495.

⁶ Enc. *Miserentissimus Redemptor*, 8 May, 1928; *A.A.S.*, 1928, XX, p. 168.

⁷ Enc. *Quadragesimo anno*, 15 May, 1931; *A.A.S.*, 1931, XXIII, p. 213.

once again, is the choice on which the fate of the whole world depends."¹

The world paid little heed to the Holy Father's call, and so, in 1937, in order to drive home the message and leave the world in no doubt about the Church's attitude, he devoted an entire encyclical to a forthright denunciation and condemnation of atheistic Communism.² He began by calling attention to the Church's consistent opposition to the movement from its very inception.

Indeed (he declared) this is the reason why the leaders of this campaign against Christian civilization in Moscow are so unrelenting in their attacks upon the Papacy; these bitter enemies of the Church are thus testifying, by their deeds if not by their words, that the Papacy is maintaining its tradition of defending the sanctuary of the Christian religion with faith inviolate, and that the Holy See, of all public authorities on earth, has been most insistent and most emphatic in denouncing and condemning the great peril of communism. But still the danger grows. Notwithstanding these repeated warnings of Ours . . . the menace of communism, fomented by skilful agitators, is becoming more and more serious every day. We have therefore deemed it necessary to raise Our voice again, and to speak now by means of this more solemn document. . . . We propose to summarize and explain the theory and principles of communism, especially as they appear in the bolshevist system, and with these fallacious doctrines to contrast the luminous teaching of the Church; and We want to renew our earnest appeal to the world to make use of those aids by which Christian civilization—the only atmosphere in which the true *Civitas humana* can thrive—may be both preserved from this terrible scourge and fostered in the interests of true social progress.³

There are many modern States which can be charged with inconsistency in their reaction to Russian Communism, for their attitude has been based on purely political considerations, and they have blown hot and cold accordingly. But it is demon-

¹ Enc. *Caritate Christi compulsi*, 3 May, 1932; A.A.S., 1932, XXIV, pp. 183-4.

² Enc. *Divini Redemptoris*, 19 March, 1937; A.A.S., 1937, XXIX, pp. 65-138.

³ C.T.S. New Translation, pars. 8, 9, 10.

strably not a charge which can be fairly levelled against the Catholic Church. She has never played politics in this affair, adapting her attitude to suit the prevailing mood of this or that power. She has never supped with the devil, even with a long spoon. On the contrary, her pronouncements for over a century have been openly and consistently based on the unalterable principles of the moral law, and her recent decree is of a piece with all of them: it merely dots the "i"s and crosses the "t"s. "In these conditions," wrote the French Cardinals in their commentary on the decree, "one cannot seriously maintain, as certain people among us have attempted to do, that the decree of the Holy Office was inspired by political designs. It is apparent, on the contrary, that its motive sprang precisely from religious reasons, and that its sole purpose is to defend the Christian faith against the all too real dangers which threaten it."¹

Nor does the decree constitute a new piece of legislation. All that it does is to apply to the four questions set before the Sacred Congregation the existing law of the Church on forbidden societies, forbidden literature, admission of public sinners to the sacraments, and the excommunication incurred by apostates. A simple examination of the four questions and answers should make this clear.

Question one: "Is it lawful to join Communist parties, or show them favour?" *Answer:* "In the negative: for Communism is materialistic and anti-Christian; moreover, Communist leaders, even though they sometimes verbally profess that they are not opposed to religion, show nevertheless, by their teaching or their deeds, that they are in reality enemies of Religion and of the Church of Christ."

This is a straightforward application of canon 684, which warns the faithful not to join "condemned, seditious, or suspect societies".

It is true that the Church has never yet condemned Communist parties *nominatim*, in the explicit manner in which she has condemned the Masonic sect. Nor, apparently, does the Holy Office regard them as "associations of the same kind" as Masonry; otherwise it need only have invoked canon 2335,

¹ Letter of 8 Sept., 1949; quoted from *The Tablet*, 24 Sept., 1949, p. 204.

which punishes membership of all such associations, "which plot against the Church or legitimate civil powers", with the same automatic excommunication.¹ But the fact remains that, for over a century, the Church has been condemning the doctrine and practice of Communists as materialistic and anti-Christian. "For the first time in human history," wrote Pius XI in *Divini Redemptoris*, "we are witnessing a calculated and systematic rebellion against 'every divine name'. The theory of communism is intrinsically hostile to religion in any form whatsoever."² Clearly, any party, whatever its label, that seeks to implement a policy so roundly and frequently condemned, falls at least into the category of "suspect" societies, which Catholics may neither join, nor support.

Communist parties incur official suspicion for the further reason that their leaders have no respect for objective truth. They have a moral code of their own, according to which, that is true and good which helps to further the cause of international Communism. Thus, in Hungary, before the *coup* which put them in power, they curried favour with the Catholic peasants by sending shock-troops out into the countryside to repair the war-damaged churches; and, in every country which has a strong Christian tradition, they continue to spread the belief that, when they come to power, they will not interfere with religious liberty, a belief which they cynically contradict by their actions as soon as they actually gain power. Pius XI warned the Bishops of this trick in 1937. "Venerable Brethren," he wrote, "see that the faithful are put on their guard against these deceitful methods. Communism is intrinsically evil, and therefore no one who desires to save Christian civilization from extinction should render it assistance in any enterprise whatever."³

The first answer of the Holy Office decree does little more than repeat this prohibition of Pius XI. It confirms the already generally received view of canonists that Communist associations are, to say the least, "suspect" societies which it is unlawful to join; and by its use of the plural "parties", not "party", it

¹ The explanation is probably that, to be of the same kind as Masonry, an association must not only plot against the Church or State, but also be a secret society. Communist parties plot, but they are not strictly speaking secret societies. Cf. *Periodica*, 1948, XXXVII, p. 103; 1949, XXXVIII, p. 126.

² C.T.S. New Translation, par. 33.

³ *Op. cit.*, par. 82.

extends the official suspicion to all communistically controlled organizations.¹

Question two: "Is it lawful to publish, disseminate, or read books, periodicals, newspapers, or leaflets which support Communist doctrine or practice, or to write in them?" *Answer*: "In the negative: for these acts are forbidden by the law itself (cf. can. 1399)."

Here too, there is clearly nothing new. The Holy Office simply calls attention to the existing law of canon 1399, which automatically places on the prohibited list: (a) "Books, by whomsoever written, which propagate heresy or schism, or seek to undermine in any way the very foundations of religion; (b) books which deliberately set themselves to attack religion or good morals; (c) books of any non-catholics, which deal professedly with religion, unless it is clear that they contain nothing contrary to Catholic faith; (d) books which impugn or deride any Catholic dogma, defend errors proscribed by the Apostolic See, disparage divine worship, seek to undermine ecclesiastical discipline, and intentionally discredit the ecclesiastical hierarchy or the clerical or religious state."²

It was already the generally held view that publications which, in the words of the decree, "support the doctrine or action of Communists", come under one or other of the above categories and are therefore prohibited matter. The Holy Office merely confirms this interpretation. In view of the fact that, for over a century, the Holy See has repeatedly condemned the doctrine and action of Communists as anti-religious, immoral, and subversive of right order, no other answer could have been expected.

The effect of the prohibition of a publication of any kind, according to canon 1398, is that it may not, without due leave, be published, read, retained, sold, translated, or communicated in any way to others. Moreover, by canon 1386, §2, if a newspaper, leaflet, or periodical makes a practice of attacking the Catholic religion or good morals, not even Catholic laymen may

¹ This is the reason for the use of the plural term, which is suggested in the unsigned commentary in the *Osservatore Romano*, 27 July, 1949.

² According to canon 1384, "books", in this context, must be taken to include newspapers, periodicals, and any other published writings whatsoever, unless the contrary is made clear.

make any written contribution to it, except for a just and reasonable cause, to be approved by the local Ordinary.

The Holy Office adds nothing to these restrictions: it simply applies them. They may seem rigorous to those who have not hitherto adverted to, or observed, the law of the Church, but they are not a new antidote to the particular poison of Communism. The Church knows from long experience what harm is done to the faith and morals of foolhardy Catholics by the reading of dangerous literature, and she has adopted the only practical method of preventing this harm, which is to place all such literature under a general ban, and provide for special cases by a system of special leave.

Question three: "May Catholics who knowingly and freely do the actions specified in Nos. 1 and 2, be admitted to the sacraments?" *Answer*: "In the negative, according to the ordinary principles governing the refusal of sacraments to those who are not disposed."

The general principle is that sacraments must be refused to the unworthy, i.e. to those whose dispositions prevent them from receiving them fruitfully. "Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine."¹

Except in the administration of Penance, the minister is not normally bound to inquire into the dispositions of the recipient. But if he has evidence, other than that which he may have acquired confessionally, which makes him morally certain that the recipient is gravely indisposed, respect for the sacrament and the duty of avoiding co-operation in another's sin oblige him normally to refuse the desired sacrament. We say "normally", because there are four cases in which it is certain, or sufficiently probable that he may co-operate materially in an unworthy reception: (a) to avoid violating the seal of confession; (b) to avoid scandal or disturbance among the faithful, who, if they do not appreciate the reason for the refusal, may be deterred from approaching the sacraments by fear of a similar rebuff; (c) to avoid defamation of a recipient whose grave unworthiness is not generally known; (d) to avoid danger of death or some similar evil to the minister himself. Only the first excuse is absolute, because under no circumstances whatever may confessional

¹ Matt. vii, 6.

knowledge be used to the displeasure of the penitent outside confession. The other three would not avail, if (as is reported to have happened in Communist countries, since the decree was issued) the unworthy person seeks to receive a sacrament *in odium fidei*, or out of contempt for religion.

The actions declared to be unlawful in the Holy Office's response to questions one and two are, in themselves, matter for grave sin; but to constitute formal mortal sin and a hindrance to fruitful reception of a sacrament, they must be done, as the wording of the third question indicates, "knowingly and freely". Ignorance of the law is still possible, in spite of all the publicity given to the decree, but where it exists, it normally can and should be corrected. The plea of lack of freedom could hardly be urged in present-day England, though it might be reasonably urged in Communist-dominated countries, where it is said to be morally impossible for many people to obtain a livelihood without joining a Communist association or subscribing to Communist publications. It is for the priest to judge according to the circumstances of each case, viewed especially in the light of public opinion, whether the element of duress is really present, and whether it reduces the "compulsory" act to the level of justifiable material co-operation, or leaves it gravely culpable. If, all things considered, the Catholic in question is judged to be gravely guilty and he refuses to amend, he must be refused absolution. If his sin is publicly known, he must be refused Holy Communion (within the limits explained above), whether he approaches publicly or privately. If his sin is not publicly known, and yet is known to the priest from some source other than sacramental confession, he must be refused if he approaches privately, but not if he approaches publicly and cannot be turned away without scandal.¹

Question four: "Do those Catholics who profess, and particularly those who defend and spread the materialistic and anti-Christian doctrine of the Communists, incur excommunication specially reserved to the Holy See, *ipso facto*, as being apostates from the Catholic faith?" *Answer*: "In the affirmative."

Here again, it is clear from the very wording that there is no question of a new penal law specially devised to meet the Com-

¹ Cf. canon 855.

munist menace. A baptized Communist, like any other subject of the Church, is automatically excluded from her communion and placed under her censure, if, and only if, he culpably does an action which, in virtue of a previously existing penal law, involves automatic excommunication. By canon 2314, one such action is apostasy from the Christian faith; and, in canon 1325, an apostate is defined as a baptized person who has "totally receded from the Christian faith".

In effect, therefore, the question which the Holy Office had to decide amounted simply to this: if a Catholic professes that materialistic conception of life which is at the very root of Communism, and which involves a rejection of essential Christian doctrines, such as the existence of a personal God, the spirituality and immortality of the soul, moral responsibility, divine providence, etc., etc., does he, by that very fact, "recede totally from the Christian faith"? The decree gives what all logical people will agree to be the only possible answer. It declines to accord to Communists the unique privilege of eating their cake and yet keeping it. A Catholic who takes Marx for his prophet is in the same boat, as far as the Church is concerned, as a baptized Nazi who has gone over to Thor, or a baptized capitalist who has abandoned Christ for Buddha; at any rate, it is not the barque of Peter.

It will be noted that the phrasing of the question carefully limits the charge of apostasy, with its inevitable consequence of excommunication, to those who profess, defend or spread the materialistic and anti-Christian *doctrine* of the Communists. Apostasy is not a matter of party membership, but of belief. There are many Catholics—especially in France and Italy, where the working-class political and trade-union movements are split into three antagonistic sections of almost equal strength—who have joined the Communist party, or subscribe to its literature, simply because they regard the Communists as the most effective champions of the just claims of the worker. They have no interest in the Communist philosophy, and cannot be said either to profess, defend or disseminate it: indeed, most of them do not even begin to understand it. They are mere dupes, beguiled and misled by astute propagandists who are prepared to promise anything, full religious freedom included, as the price

of a vote; but they are not, at least consciously, apostates from the faith of Christ.

The Holy Office does not exonerate these misguided camp-followers from all blame and penalty, as is clear from its answers to the first three questions. In giving their names or their support to the Communist party, or its literature, they are not only aiding and abetting a movement which is anti-Christian in its theory and practice, but disobeying grave laws of the Church. These are objectively gravely sinful acts, and no amount of good motives can make a bad act good. But until they embrace a doctrine which is irreconcilable with faith in Christ, as the official Communist doctrine has many times been declared to be, they do not incur excommunication as apostates.

As the French Cardinals rightly emphasize in their letter on the decree, the action of the Holy Office does not mean that the Church has thrown in her lot with capitalism as against collectivism, or sided with the Western *bloc* in the cold war that is being waged against Russia and its satellites. It is her divinely allotted function to preach the Gospel of Christ and interpret the moral law, and she will not sell her birthright for a mess of pottage, whether from Moscow, or from Wall Street. She is dissatisfied with the existing social order and anxious to transform it into a new order, but it must be an order based on Christian principles. To Communist and Capitalist alike she must continue to declare with her divine Master: "He that is not with me, is against me: and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth."¹

LAWRENCE L. McREAVY

"BEHOLD THE LAMB OF GOD"

THESE magnificent words of the Baptist are so familiar, so dear to us through their constant use in the liturgy and in private devotion, so hallowed and canonized by their applica-

¹ Matt. xii, 30.

tion to the Church's dogma, that it may seem otiose, if not downright impertinent, to ask what the Baptist meant by them. Yet on reflection, the question is seen to be not without point. Remember, these words were spoken at the very beginning of Our Lord's public life; He had been baptized by John, had gone into the desert and then, on His return, the Baptist exclaims: "Behold the Lamb of God, the Lamb taking away the sin of the world." And again the next day, when Jesus returned to the Jordan, the Baptist once more cries out: "Behold the Lamb of God." And the result? Two of his disciples abandon him to follow Our Lord.

What did he mean? At first sight one would say he was designating Our Lord as the sacrificial victim sent by God who by His death would take away the world's sin. If one accepts this view, then all that remains is to discover just why the Baptist speaks of Our Lord as a Lamb. Had he any definite lamb in mind, familiar to his hearers, so that they would recognize the allusion and at once seize his meaning? It may seem a minor issue, but it is important if one is to get at the mind and meaning of the Baptist.

It may well be that the Baptist had in mind the Paschal Lamb that was sacrificed year by year in joyful memory of Israel's deliverance from the Egyptian bondage. Colour is given to this view by the fact that when these words were spoken "the Pasch of the Jews was at hand" (John ii, 13), and men's thoughts would readily turn to the Paschal Lamb that they would all so soon be celebrating. Yet the Paschal sacrifice was hardly expiatory; the dominant note of the celebration was convivial and eucharistic; it was the feast in which the memory of God's loving deliverance was commemorated.

Perhaps, then, John Baptist was thinking of the Tamid, the perpetual sacrifice, morning and evening, in the Temple. Yet here again the same difficulty may be urged. The Tamid was a holocaust and although expiation found a place, what predominated was the gesture of total submission, of reverence and love, and the kindly acceptance of that gesture by Jahwe.

There remains a third possibility; the Baptist is referring to the Servant Song in Isaiah 53 where the expiatory sufferings of the Servant are prophesied:

- 53.6: We all like sheep had gone astray
 We had turned each his own way
 And Jahwe made to light upon him
 The iniquities of us all
- 7: He was afflicted but he was resigned
 And he opened not his mouth;
 Like a lamb that is led to the slaughter
 And a ewe lamb that is dumb before its shearers . . .
- II: A righteous one, My Servant, shall make many
 righteous
 And their iniquities he shall bear.¹

This is attractive and has much to recommend it. In both *Isaias* and *John* it is a person that is referred to, the Servant of Jahwe and Jesus of Nazareth; in both sin is removed universally (which was not so in the case of animal sacrifices); in *Isaias* it is asserted time and again that the Servant is suffering for others, taking upon himself their sin and its attendant punishment: according to the Baptist, Our Lord is the lamb who takes away the sin of the world *ὁ ἀμνὸς, ὁ αἵρων τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, ὁ αἵρων*: the participle may have a future reference; more likely it denotes the peculiar function of the Lamb; He is God's Lamb whose office and character is just this, to take away sin, all in the world that is opposed to God. It should be noted that in *Isaias* the Servant takes away sin by taking it upon himself; so much cannot be said of the Baptist's Lamb, who is merely said to take away sin. It is further objected that whereas *Isaias* merely likens the Servant to a lamb, the Baptist expressly and directly calls Our Lord The Lamb—but the difference between simile and metaphor is not so great and the Evangelist is not giving us a word for word account; it is hardly likely that the Baptist threw out a succinct reference like this without enlightening his disciples further.

In support of this *Isaian* origin for the Baptist's words it may also be urged that he is certainly familiar with *Isaias*. Ederheim, indeed, goes so far as to say that the Baptist's mind seems saturated with the prophecies of *Isaias*. Thus, when asked who he is, he takes his name from *Isaias*: "The voice of one crying in

¹ Kissane's Trans.

the wilderness"; from Isaias he draws his image of the threshing floor and the fan, of the consuming fire and, probably, of the axe laid to the root of the tree, and in replying to his deputation from prison it is to Isaias that Our Lord appeals for answer (Matt. ii, 1).

These three suggested origins for the Baptist's words all suppose that Our Lord is designated as the Victim sent by God for the salvation of the world. But there are many who reject this interpretation root and branch and their objection may, for convenience, be placed under two heads: (1) the idea of universal salvation runs right against current Messianic expectation which was predominantly nationalistic and political; (2) the idea of a suffering Messiah was quite alien from the mind of the Baptist.

The first objection is typically rationalistic and does not bear close examination. Messianic expectations were multiple, and even if they were largely worldly there is no cause to attribute the same to John Baptist. Elizabeth and Simeon had a more spiritual outlook, so too the Baptist's father, Zachary, who surely may be supposed to have had some influence on his son. There was, indeed, no narrowness in the Baptist, nothing worldly in his message; he preaches penance and a spiritual renewal, and to clinch the matter we have the evidence of his own words, for he inveighs precisely against any hopes of national privilege: "Think not to say within yourselves: 'We have Abraham for our father', for I tell you that God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham" (Matt. iii, 9). John Baptist was not altogether deaf to the message of the prophets or to the promptings of the Spirit.

The second objection is more weighty and finds supporters not only among the rationalists but also among Catholic commentators of no mean repute. How, they ask, could the Baptist possibly have understood that the Messiah was doomed to suffering and death and that only so would He redeem the world? None of the Apostles could tolerate the idea; Peter, even after his heavenly inspired profession of faith at Caesarea, protests: "Lord, be it far from Thee, this shall not be unto Thee" (Matt. xvi, 22). And yet it is asserted that John Baptist from the very first understood and proclaimed the expiatory, sacrificial

of a vote; but they are not, at least consciously, apostates from the faith of Christ.

The Holy Office does not exonerate these misguided camp-followers from all blame and penalty, as is clear from its answers to the first three questions. In giving their names or their support to the Communist party, or its literature, they are not only aiding and abetting a movement which is anti-Christian in its theory and practice, but disobeying grave laws of the Church. These are objectively gravely sinful acts, and no amount of good motives can make a bad act good. But until they embrace a doctrine which is irreconcilable with faith in Christ, as the official Communist doctrine has many times been declared to be, they do not incur excommunication as apostates.

As the French Cardinals rightly emphasize in their letter on the decree, the action of the Holy Office does not mean that the Church has thrown in her lot with capitalism as against collectivism, or sided with the Western *bloc* in the cold war that is being waged against Russia and its satellites. It is her divinely allotted function to preach the Gospel of Christ and interpret the moral law, and she will not sell her birthright for a mess of pottage, whether from Moscow, or from Wall Street. She is dissatisfied with the existing social order and anxious to transform it into a new order, but it must be an order based on Christian principles. To Communist and Capitalist alike she must continue to declare with her divine Master: "He that is not with me, is against me: and he that gathereth not with me, scattereth."¹

LAWRENCE L. McREAVY

"BEHOLD THE LAMB OF GOD"

THESE magnificent words of the Baptist are so familiar, so dear to us through their constant use in the liturgy and in private devotion, so hallowed and canonized by their applica-

¹ Matt. xii, 30.

tion to the Church's dogma, that it may seem otiose, if not downright impertinent, to ask what the Baptist meant by them. Yet on reflection, the question is seen to be not without point. Remember, these words were spoken at the very beginning of Our Lord's public life; He had been baptized by John, had gone into the desert and then, on His return, the Baptist exclaims: "Behold the Lamb of God, the Lamb taking away the sin of the world." And again the next day, when Jesus returned to the Jordan, the Baptist once more cries out: "Behold the Lamb of God." And the result? Two of his disciples abandon him to follow Our Lord.

What did he mean? At first sight one would say he was designating Our Lord as the sacrificial victim sent by God who by His death would take away the world's sin. If one accepts this view, then all that remains is to discover just why the Baptist speaks of Our Lord as a Lamb. Had he any definite lamb in mind, familiar to his hearers, so that they would recognize the allusion and at once seize his meaning? It may seem a minor issue, but it is important if one is to get at the mind and meaning of the Baptist.

It may well be that the Baptist had in mind the Paschal Lamb that was sacrificed year by year in joyful memory of Israel's deliverance from the Egyptian bondage. Colour is given to this view by the fact that when these words were spoken "the Pasch of the Jews was at hand" (John ii, 13), and men's thoughts would readily turn to the Paschal Lamb that they would all so soon be celebrating. Yet the Paschal sacrifice was hardly expiatory; the dominant note of the celebration was convivial and eucharistic; it was the feast in which the memory of God's loving deliverance was commemorated.

Perhaps, then, John Baptist was thinking of the Tamid, the perpetual sacrifice, morning and evening, in the Temple. Yet here again the same difficulty may be urged. The Tamid was a holocaust and although expiation found a place, what predominated was the gesture of total submission, of reverence and love, and the kindly acceptance of that gesture by Jahwe.

There remains a third possibility; the Baptist is referring to the Servant Song in Isaiah 53 where the expiatory sufferings of the Servant are prophesied:

- 53.6: We all like sheep had gone astray
 We had turned each his own way
 And Jahwe made to light upon him
 The iniquities of us all
- 7: He was afflicted but he was resigned
 And he opened not his mouth;
 Like a lamb that is led to the slaughter
 And a ewe lamb that is dumb before its shearers . . .
- II: A righteous one, My Servant, shall make many
 righteous
 And their iniquities he shall bear.¹

This is attractive and has much to recommend it. In both *Isaias* and *John* it is a person that is referred to, the Servant of Jahwe and Jesus of Nazareth; in both sin is removed universally (which was not so in the case of animal sacrifices); in *Isaias* it is asserted time and again that the Servant is suffering for others, taking upon himself their sin and its attendant punishment: according to the Baptist, Our Lord is the lamb who takes away the sin of the world *ὁ ἄμνος, ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, ὁ αἴρων*: the participle may have a future reference; more likely it denotes the peculiar function of the Lamb; He is God's Lamb whose office and character is just this, to take away sin, all in the world that is opposed to God. It should be noted that in *Isaias* the Servant takes away sin by taking it upon himself; so much cannot be said of the Baptist's Lamb, who is merely said to take away sin. It is further objected that whereas *Isaias* merely likens the Servant to a lamb, the Baptist expressly and directly calls Our Lord The Lamb—but the difference between simile and metaphor is not so great and the Evangelist is not giving us a word for word account; it is hardly likely that the Baptist threw out a succinct reference like this without enlightening his disciples further.

In support of this *Isaian* origin for the Baptist's words it may also be urged that he is certainly familiar with *Isaias*. Ederheim, indeed, goes so far as to say that the Baptist's mind seems saturated with the prophecies of *Isaias*. Thus, when asked who he is, he takes his name from *Isaias*: "The voice of one crying in

¹ Kissane's Trans.

the wilderness"; from Isaias he draws his image of the threshing floor and the fan, of the consuming fire and, probably, of the axe laid to the root of the tree, and in replying to his deputation from prison it is to Isaias that Our Lord appeals for answer (Matt. ii, 1).

These three suggested origins for the Baptist's words all suppose that Our Lord is designated as the Victim sent by God for the salvation of the world. But there are many who reject this interpretation root and branch and their objection may, for convenience, be placed under two heads: (1) the idea of universal salvation runs right against current Messianic expectation which was predominantly nationalistic and political; (2) the idea of a suffering Messiah was quite alien from the mind of the Baptist.

The first objection is typically rationalistic and does not bear close examination. Messianic expectations were multiple, and even if they were largely worldly there is no cause to attribute the same to John Baptist. Elizabeth and Simeon had a more spiritual outlook, so too the Baptist's father, Zachary, who surely may be supposed to have had some influence on his son. There was, indeed, no narrowness in the Baptist, nothing worldly in his message; he preaches penance and a spiritual renewal, and to clinch the matter we have the evidence of his own words, for he inveighs precisely against any hopes of national privilege: "Think not to say within yourselves: 'We have Abraham for our father', for I tell you that God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham" (Matt. iii, 9). John Baptist was not altogether deaf to the message of the prophets or to the promptings of the Spirit.

The second objection is more weighty and finds supporters not only among the rationalists but also among Catholic commentators of no mean repute. How, they ask, could the Baptist possibly have understood that the Messiah was doomed to suffering and death and that only so would He redeem the world? None of the Apostles could tolerate the idea; Peter, even after his heavenly inspired profession of faith at Cæsarea, protests: "Lord, be it far from Thee, this shall not be unto Thee" (Matt. xvi, 22). And yet it is asserted that John Baptist from the very first understood and proclaimed the expiatory, sacrificial

character of Christ's mission. Prat will have nothing of it. The Lamb is a symbol of innocence, and Jesus, appearing among the group of sinners going down to John's baptism, is Innocence itself. That, he thinks, is the probable meaning of the Baptist's words: Behold the Lamb—behold the innocent one who, far from having anything in common with sin is able to take away the sin of the world. There is no need to lend the Baptist a theory of the redemptive death which none of his hearers would have understood (and which, we may add, *de facto*, none of his disciples did understand.)¹

Lagrange² offers the same interpretation but adds even more objections. Granting, he says, that John Baptist had a deeper understanding of Christ's messiahship than Peter and the other Apostles, which is not absolutely impossible, it would have to be admitted that there has been a very great change in the Baptist's Messianic conceptions. In the Synoptists we have a quite other picture; there the Messiah is depicted as a Judge, coming with fan and fire to cleanse his threshing floor. "You brood of vipers, who hath showed you to flee from the wrath to come?" And how reconcile so deep an insight as is claimed for the Baptist with the deputation sent by him from prison, asking "Art thou the Christ or look we for another?" (Matt. ii, 2-6; Luke vii, 18-33). Moreover, champions of the expiatory explanation cannot agree among themselves; some, as we have seen, seek an origin in the Pascal Lamb, others in the daily sacrifice, others in Isaias. But, according to Lagrange, neither of the sacrifices was expiatory and the Isaian reference is too brief, too vague for the Baptist's hearers to grasp; add, too, that whereas in John the Lamb merely takes away, in Isaias the Servant of Jahwe takes upon himself, and thus takes away, the sin of the world. No, Christ appears among sinful men, sinless Himself, and He it is, He the Innocent one, who takes away the world's sin; *ὁ ἀμὸς ὁ ἁῖρων*: taking away sin, cleansing his threshing floor—and this fits in well with current Messianic expectation and harmonizes with the Synoptic account of the Messiah. This explanation, Lagrange concludes, conformable to historic method and backed by tradition, should not give

¹ Prat, *Jesus Christ*, I, p. 174. 7th ed.

² *Evangile selon St Jean*, 8th ed., 1947, pp. cxxxix foll. and 39-41.

way to an expiatory interpretation indebted largely to Luther. Such objections are deserving of attention, the more so as they are urged by so eminent a scholar as Fr Lagrange.

For Liberal critics the solution is only too easy. They either ascribe the saying to the Baptist and reject any sacrificial reference or, allowing such reference, reject the historicity of the passage: it is an insertion of John Evangelist, fruit of later experience and reflection.¹ With this we cannot, of course, agree. But let us see how far Lagrange's objections are compelling.

It is true that the Baptist's designation of Our Lord as the Lamb strikes a note not sounded by the Synoptists. But is that surprising? No one has ever been so many-sided as Our Lord, and no single designation is adequate to express His infinite variety. The Gospels are all fragmentary accounts and do not profess to tell us everything. Note, too, that of the four evangelists only John had been a disciple of the Baptist, was probably the only one to hear these words spoken or to have talked over with John Baptist the meaning of his words. John, too, may well be doing here what he does elsewhere—fill out the synoptic picture, give a new slant not stressed by the others and so redress the balance.

But to ascribe such a meaning to the Baptist's words is to suppose him more enlightened at the beginning of Our Lord's life than the Apostles were at the end. That may be so, but John Baptist was the greatest of the prophets and they, too, however darkly, foretold suffering and vicarious suffering. He was sanctified in the womb and leapt with joy at the coming of His Lord. Of him the Angel foretold that he was to be filled with the Holy Ghost; a special revelation was granted to him and at Our Lord's baptism he saw the Dove descending and heard the attesting words. All this, because of his office which was to prepare the way for Christ; and if the atoning death was, in fact, to play so large a part in Christ's mission, it is not altogether

¹ Spitta's theory is interesting, that the Lamb is symbol not of innocence or meekness but of powerful leadership, but his evidence is not, I think, conclusive. He appeals to the Apocrypha, the Apocalypse and Isaiah xvi, 1. His is, however, a case of special pleading . . . the rebuttal of charges of effeminacy against Christ and Christianity. He denies the historicity of Jn. i, 29, looking on it as a later amplification by John Evangelist of Jn. i, 36. For an account of Spitta's views, cf. "The Lamb of God", by J. Robertson Cameron, in *The Expositor*, 1910, pp. 173-87, 266-81.

fanciful that the forerunner should at least hint at the future. Let us agree with Prat that there is no need to lend the Baptist a theory of redemption; that does not mean that the idea, vague perhaps, was beyond him. And as for his hearers not being likely to understand, well, seminal sayings are not uncommon in the scriptures; how much of Our Lord's own doctrine was fully grasped by the Apostles before the coming of the Holy Ghost? But the seed is sown and one inclines to think that the constant references to the Lamb in the Apocalypse owe something to this deep saying of the Evangelist's first master.

Nor is such initial insight at odds with the delegation sent later by John Baptist from prison, asking, "Art thou he that is to come or look we for another?" (Luke vii, 18 foll.). The most common reply of Catholic commentators is that the Baptist sent the delegation not for his own sake but for the sake of his disciples—and not without reason. The Baptist's disciples did not all take kindly to Our Lord; some of them viewed Him with suspicion, even with jealousy. They, along with the Pharisees, complained that Christ and His followers did not fast (Matt. ix, 14), and one gets the impression that Our Lord's miracles filled them not so much with admiration as with envy. Certainly the newcomer's successes provoked an outburst: "Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond the Jordan, to whom thou gavest testimony, behold he baptiseth and all men come to him" (John iii, 26). But the Baptist's reactions are quite other—exultation, joy. He is like the friend of the bridegroom who, in Jewish fashion, makes all necessary preparations and then, when the bridegroom appears, retires, his task accomplished. "This my joy therefore is fulfilled" (John iii, 29). "He must increase but I, I must decrease." It may, too, be urged that he *had* to send his followers to Our Lord; his own success had been enormous, witness the disciples whom Paul found at Ephesus (Acts xix, 1-7); and at the end of the first century John Evangelist still has to point out that *he* was not the light. The only way he could convince those devoted followers of his was by sending them to ask and see for themselves, just as previously he had sent them to the Lamb. One may, possibly, detect a note of wonder, of impatience even, that the Christ is not moving more quickly, but that does not mean doubt or loss of faith; even Mary and

Joseph were nonplussed by Our Lord and "understood not the word that He spoke to them". John Baptist was no reed shaken by the wind; he was, as Our Lord himself proclaimed, "a burning and a shining light"; and immediately after receiving the delegation Our Lord launches out on His greatest encomium of John: "A prophet? Yea, I tell you, and more than a prophet . . . Amen I say to you, there hath not risen among them that are born of women a greater than John the Baptist" (Matt. ii, 9, 11). Doubt, loss of faith are inconceivable in John; that voice crying in the wilderness does not falter nor does his hand ever cease to point to Our Lord.

There remains Lagrange's claim that his interpretation, "Lo! the Innocent One," is traditional and his insinuation that the expiatory interpretation owes its popularity to Luther. For so learned a scholar, this is an extraordinary claim. To substantiate it he refers to Chrysostom, Augustine and St Thomas—rather unfortunately, I think. Chrysostom is cited as saying: "He who is so pure that He can wash away the sins of others certainly did not come to confess His own sins." That is very well said, but Chrysostom goes on (and this is not cited): "He calls Him the Lamb, recalling to the minds of the Jews the prophecy of Isaias and that foreshadowing lamb (*umbram illam*) of Moses's day, that by means of a figure he may lead them more surely to the truth. That lamb, indeed, took the sins of none, but this, the sins of the whole world."¹ It is the same with Augustine; he, according to Lagrange, sees in the Baptist's words no allusion to the suffering Messiah but only to the Innocence of the Lamb: "*qui non assumpsit de nostra massa peccatum, ipse est qui tollit nostrum peccatum.*" But Augustine here has in mind those heretics who claimed power to forgive sins because of their own purity² and subsequently, commenting on the same passage from John, he says "He is the Lamb of God because only so, only by the blood of this Lamb, could men be redeemed."³ The same may be said of St Thomas, and indeed tradition seems to be unanimous in seeing a sacrificial reference to the Baptist's words. Origen sees an allusion to Is. liii and Jer. ii, 19; Cyril of Alexandria and Theophylact to Isaias and the Pascal Lamb; Euthymius to "*umbræ V.T. ac Isaiæ prophetia*"; Theodore of

¹ P.G. 59, 108 foll.

² P.L. 35, 1410.

³ P.L. 35, 1439.

Mopsuestia alludes only to Isaias, Bede and Alcuin to the Pascal Lamb.¹ It is the same with both Protestant and Catholic commentators and theologians, right on until the arrival of the Rationalists, and when Melancthon asserts that Catholic commentators did not make enough of the sacrificial interpretation he is soon taken to task by both Canisius and Salmeron.² It is then, I think, certain that tradition has consistently seen in the words of the Baptist more than an assertion of Christ's innocence, and the varied references give us a clue to the full meaning of John Baptist's words. No need to limit his allusion to one passage from Isaias or to one typical sacrifice; rather does he see in Our Lord reality coming to replace the premonitory shadows; not *a* lamb, *a* victim, but *The* Lamb, *The* Victim sent by God for the salvation of the world.

John Baptist stands between two worlds, the old and the new; the old is passing, not so much passing away as passing into the new, and for the Baptist, as for us, the old finds its completion in Christ. This idea of fulfilment runs through the Baptist's witness: HE is coming who will perfect what has been: "He that shall come after me is mightier than I." He, John Baptist, is nobody, a man without a name, merely a voice proclaiming the coming one who, indeed, is already come and is standing in their midst. And even as he is nobody, so his baptism is nothing. For the Jews, a ritual purification was enough; it was not enough for him. His baptism is of the flesh, of the earth—"I, indeed, baptize you in water"; Christ's is from above—"He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and fire." Both the man and his work are preparatory and they both look to Christ for their very *raison d'être*. Now the hour is come and the bridegroom, so often spoken of and sung in the Old Testament, is at hand to receive Israel, his bride, from the bridegroom's friend.

It is in this context that the Baptist proclaims Our Lord to be the Lamb of God and again the idea of completion, of per-

¹ Origen: P.G. 14, 289. Cyril Alex. P.G. 73, 192. Theophylact. P.G. 123, 1172. Euthymius. P.G. 129, 1133. Theodore. P.G. 66, 736. Bede. P.L. 92, 648. Alcuin P.L. 100, 755.

² For this, as for so much else in this article, I am indebted to Federkiewicz; *Verbum Domini*, 1932, pp. 41 foll. If I do not follow him to the end, that does not detract from the help and inspiration he has been on the way.

fecting, is not absent. We ourselves look back to all that had gone before, finding in it hints and presages of what was to be, and it is not far-fetched to think that the Baptist in designating Christ as the Lamb of God was mindful, too, of what lay behind his prophetic words. We indeed can see more—Christ, priest and victim, the Shepherd who lays down His life and the lamb that is offered, gathering up, resuming in Himself all those groping sacrifices that reached out to Him and found favour in the past only because of Him who was to come, "the offerings of Abel thy child, the sacrifice of Abraham our patriarch and that which thy high priest Melchisedech offered, a holy sacrifice, a spotless host"—goodly offerings but loud with their own inadequacy, "a shadow", as St Paul would say, "a shadow of things to come but the substance is of Christ" (Col. ii, 17).

So, too, for the Baptist, the designation of Christ as the Lamb must have meant far more than innocence only. The Lamb was a sacrificial animal, consecrated to such use through the centuries, and the word on the Baptist's lips hints at that past and its fulfilment. All that had gone before in the way of sacrifice: sin offering and peace offering, renewed so often throughout the years that had gone; the lavish holocausts of individual Jews; the heroic sacrifice of Abraham who spared not his only-begotten son till God in His loving mercy provided a victim in Isaac's stead; the inspired foretellings of the prophets, notably of Isaias; the Tamid where the blood of lambs was poured out morning and evening, a perpetual sacrifice "for a savour of sweetness", still being offered then when the Baptist spoke his words; the Pascal Lamb, memory and type of a glorious deliverance, "and the Pasch of the Jews was at hand" . . . this, and more, did in fact lie behind the Baptist's words; will he, greatest of the prophets, have been blind to it all? The Messiah, he says, the Messiah, so dearly longed for, is come; the judge, foretold by the prophets lo! he is here; the bridegroom coming for his bride, see! he is at hand and this my joy therefore is fulfilled; the baptism of water, *that* is only that He may be made manifest in Israel and must yield to His baptism of the Spirit; and now, behold, the Lamb, *the* Lamb, the Lamb of God, God's own and sent by God. He is here, the Lamb taking away the sin of the world.

So John Baptist sees the world's victim and ransom, darkly perhaps, and with no clear idea of the precise nature of the sacrifice; but no matter; prophetic foresight is often so. Enough that the Lamb has appeared, spelling the salvation of the world. Later the others will see clearly what he has darkly foretold; John Evangelist will see in the crucified Lord the antitype of the Pascal Lamb ("you shall not break a bone of him"); Philip will preach Jesus to the eunuch, Jesus the Lamb of Isaiah's song; Peter will recall our redemption by the blood of Christ "as of a lamb unspotted and undefiled", and the Apocalypse will ring with His name. So the Baptist's words have come down to us, rich with meaning, charged with blessed memories, and Christ who sums up, recapitulates, all things, is indeed "the lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Apoc. xiii, 8). *In figuris praesignatur*; it is hard to see how the Baptist could have been unaware of that providential foreshadowing.

T. SMALLEY, S.J.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

CIVIL RELATIONS WITH COMMUNIST GOVERNMENTS

Now that it is perfectly evident that the Communist-dominated governments of Eastern Europe, in particular at the present moment Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, are directly persecuting the Church and denying the most elementary rights and liberties to the individual, ought Catholics in other countries to urge actively that their governments refrain from all commercial agreements (alternative, break off official relations) with those governments? (S.)

REPLY

i. In weighing the wrongness of any action or line of conduct, whether on the part of individuals or of States, our first

concern is to see whether it is intrinsically wrong. Public relations, both commercial and diplomatic, with a government which is persecuting the Church, are clearly not wrong in themselves. Discussing a somewhat similar topic in this REVIEW a few years ago¹ our conclusion was that it is lawful for a Christian State to enter upon a belligerent alliance with a State which is professedly anti-Christian. For the point to be examined is not the internal policy of the anti-Christian government, but the enterprise which it is proposed to undertake in alliance, namely the purpose of the war. If this purpose is unjust, an alliance even between two Catholic States is intrinsically wrong. Similarly, one must regard the immediate purpose of the commercial or diplomatic relations.

ii. The Communist government is almost certainly excommunicated, either as such or as persons attacking the rights of the Church. In earlier days excommunication carried with it the obligation on the rest of the faithful to avoid even civil relations with persons under this ecclesiastical censure. This is no longer the law except, from canon 2267, in the case of *excommunicatus vitandus*, and even then a reasonable cause justifies civil communication. One cannot, therefore, discern at the present time any positive law of the Church forbidding commercial or diplomatic alliance with a Communist government.

iii. It is understood, however, that the treaties signed at Paris in 1947 with countries which have since become Communist and anti-Catholic, included an article safeguarding religious freedom in these countries. It is for the other parties to this agreement to secure by all means which are lawful and opportune the due observance of this article of the Treaty, and it may well be that a commercial or diplomatic rupture might secure its observance; on the other hand it might intensify the Communist and anti-Catholic activities of these Governments. A decision on the sanctions to be applied for implementing a treaty must be left to the responsible government, and it will depend very largely on its political complexion. It is open to Catholic subjects, if they so desire, to urge by every lawful means the application of sanctions, exactly as they would in any other question of public policy. But, in our view, one cannot say

¹ THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1941, XXI, p. 239.
Vol. xxxii

that Catholic subjects "ought", i.e. that they have a moral obligation, to urge such sanctions. There may be other grave reasons arguing against this policy, and Catholics may, if they wish, refrain from urging it, leaving it to the responsible government to adopt whatever policy seems best in the circumstances.

CONFESSIONS DURING A TRAIN JOURNEY

The law now extends the faculty of canon 883 to a journey by air, an extension which was permitted by some canonists even before the law expressly did so. Are there any canonists who now extend the faculty to a long journey by train, an extension which is not yet expressly sanctioned by the law? If so, may this opinion be followed? (E. R.)

REPLY

Pius XII, *Motu Proprio*, 16 December, 1947; THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1948, XXX, p. 344: Nos . . . motu proprio, certa scientia et matura deliberatione, de Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine, statuimus ac decernimus ut quae can. 883 C.I.C. de facultate excipiendi confessiones sanciantur pro sacerdotibus maritimum iter habentibus, valeant atque extendantur, consentaneis quidem clausulis, ad sacerdotes iter aërium facientes.

Canon 20: Si certa de re desit expressum praescriptum legis sive generalis sive particularis, norma sumenda est, nisi agatur de poenis applicandis, a legibus latis in similibus; a generalibus iuris principiiis cum aequitate canonica servatis; a stylo et praxi Curiae Romanae; a communi sententia doctorum.

i. Long before the 1937 *Motu Proprio*, certain commentators sufficient in number and authority to establish a probable opinion, relying on the principle of canon 20, held that the faculty of canon 883 also applied to a journey by air; there were also some who took the gloomy view that a journey by air was always accompanied by danger of death, and that confessional faculties were therefore enjoyed from canon 882 in any case.¹

¹ THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1941, XX, p. 552; *Periodica*, 1945, p. 32.

ii. The *Motu Proprio* was issued in response to the petitions of many Ordinaries, and it is not unlikely that, at some future time, the Holy See will extend the faculty to a journey by train. Examples exist of this favour being granted by indult, for example during pilgrimages, and the reasons which make it desirable to facilitate confession on a voyage by sea or air apply equally to a long train journey. Cappello, writing before the *Motu Proprio*, thought it probable that canon 883 was applicable both to travelling by air and to long journeys, for example across Siberia, by train.¹ Since the *Motu Proprio* appeared the view favouring the extension of the faculty to a train journey has been defended² by applying canon 20 to the case.

iii. Whilst admitting the right of any confessor to form his own judgement on the matter, it is our opinion that the faculty may not be extended beyond the limits of canon 883 and of the *Motu Proprio*. The difficulty of obtaining faculties from the local Ordinary, one of the reasons for the extended faculty, applies equally indeed to a journey by train. There is, however, a point which is verified when journeying by sea or air, but not verified when travelling by train: in a ship or in an aeroplane it is rarely known which diocese, if any, is being traversed, whereas in a train the boundaries of dioceses are capable of being ascertained, and it appears that this local or territorial aspect is a most important element to consider in the law of canon 883, since the rights of local Ordinaries are not patently infringed; the law permitting confessions to be heard at ports of call, when faculties are obtained from canon 883, is merely accessory to the chief benefit of the canon, which is to facilitate confessions during a voyage. The desirability of providing for confessions during a long train journey must have been apparent to the Holy See when the *Motu Proprio* was issued, and nevertheless no provision was made for the situation.³

The most reliable commentators, accordingly, so far decline to extend the faculty beyond the terms of canon 883 and the *Motu Proprio*.⁴ They also express the wish, which all priests will share, that the Holy See may make some provision for a journey by train. The difficulty is in defining the limits of such journeys.

¹ *De Poenitentia*, §300.

² *Periodica*, loc. cit.

³ *Periodica*, 1949, p. 30.

⁴ *E.T.L.*, 1948, p. 463; 1949, p. 250.

The fringes of the existing law have produced a number of casuistical questions in defining the nature of a voyage by sea¹ and these will be increased if the faculty is extended to land journeys. If trains are included it will be difficult to exclude motor-cars, cycles, or even a journey on foot. A train journey across Siberia, as Cappello intimates, seems to call for some concession, but what of a train journey from Charing Cross to Waterloo?

MARRIAGE: CASUS PERPLEXUS

In a case discussed in this journal (1949, XXXII, p. 47), a priest forgot to apply for a dispensation from third degree consanguinity, and the solution offered was to allow the parties to make the contract with a condition, since it was held that the impediment being public could not be dispensed by the parish priest from canon 1045, §3. Could it not, however, be argued that since in the circumstances the parties and the public in general probably think that a dispensation has been obtained, the existence of the impediment is actually occult, and therefore it can be dispensed as such by the parish priest? (D.)

REPLY

Canon 1045, §3: In iisdem rerum adiunctis (cum iam omnia sunt parata ad nuptias) eadem facultate (super impedimentis in can. 1043) gaudeant omnes de quibus in can. 1044 (parochus, sacerdos ad normam can. 1098.2, confessarius), sed solum pro casibus occultis in quibus nec loci quidem Ordinarius adiri possit.

i. Since the intention of the legislator in canon 1045, §3, is to provide ample faculties for meeting the situation when an impediment is not detected until everything has been prepared for the marriage, the law is rightly to be interpreted as generously as possible. An official interpretation of this kind, which does not, however, cover the case we are discussing, decided that impediments public in nature though occult in fact come

¹ Cf. THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1941, XX, p. 86.

within the terms of canon 1045, §3.¹ Some commentators use another distinction for describing a situation where the fact giving rise to an impediment is public, but where it is not publicly known that the law has established an impediment: the impediment is said to be "materialiter publicum, formaliter occultum", for example, in a case where it is known that one party is the baptismal sponsor of the other party, but where it is unknown that this constitutes a diriment impediment of spiritual relationship. It may be held as probable that a case of this kind is occult within the meaning of canon 1045, §3.²

ii. A writer in *Periodica*, 1926, p. 85, extends this notion of "impedimentum formaliter occultum" to a case where the priest applied for a dispensation and the Ordinary failed to reply. It is analogous to our case since in both instances it could happen that the parties and the public in general think that the impediment has been dispensed. The writer's solution is: "Si ita res se habent, dicemus casum considerari posse ut occultum, ad mentem c. 1045, si defectus obtentae dispensationis non possit revelari sine probabili gravis mali periculo." He is supported by Arendt in *Jus Pontificium*, 1926, p. 152, and quoted with approval by Oesterle in *Consultationes De Iure Matrimoniali*, p. 143; there is, moreover, some support for the distinction between "materialiter" and "formaliter" in canon 2197.4, which applies the distinction to "delicta" in the penal law.

iii. In solving the query in this journal, 1949, XXXII, p. 47, we did not deal with the case of an impediment which is public materially but formally occult, and indeed the statement in the question that it was a public impediment "in every sense" was taken to exclude the distinction altogether. Nevertheless it certainly could be argued that, in the circumstances, everyone assumes that the dispensation was obtained. We think that the opinion outlined above in (ii) is probable and that it can be applied to this case, if desired; as an alternative to a conditioned marriage contract, which is always to be avoided if possible, the parish priest could dispense from the impediment of third degree consanguinity, relying on the opinion that "pro

¹ Code Commission, 28 December, 1927.

² Vromant, *De Matrimonio*, §116; Payen, I, §669: id est vulgo notum, quatenus est factum, sed vulgo ignotum, quatenus est impedimentum.

casibus occultis" of canon 1045, §3, includes impediments which are public materially but formally occult.

RECEIVING A CONVERT IN DANGER OF DEATH

On what canonical principle is one required to have recourse to the Ordinary after receiving a convert in danger of death? It would appear from canon 2252 that this is not necessary. (X.)

REPLY

Canon 2252: Qui in periculo mortis constituti, a sacerdote, specialis facultatis experte, receperunt absolutionem ab aliqua censura ab homine vel a censura specialissimo modo Sedi Apostolicae reservata, tenentur, postquam convalescerint, obligatione recurrendi, sub poena reincidentiae. . . .

Canon 2314, §2: Si tamen delictum apostasiae, haeresis vel schismatis ad forum externum Ordinarii loci quovis modo deductum fuerit, etiam per voluntariam confessionem, idem Ordinarius . . . resipiscentem, praevia abiuratione iuridice peracta aliisque servatis de iure servandis, sua auctoritate ordinaria in foro exteriori absolvere potest. . . .

Cardinal Vaughan, *Monitum*, 8 May, 1902 (*Westminster Synod*, 1902, p. 21): . . . quum praeterea expediat ut Episcopi, summi in suis Dioecesibus Pastores, qui iuxta evangelicam institutionem oves suas agnoscere debent, illas praesertim oves agnoscant quae a pascuis alienis in unicum Jesu Christi ovile reducantur; idcirco ab Episcopis unanimis, in recenti suo annuo Provinciae Westmonasteriensis Conventu, decisum est ut convertendorum Ecclesiae reconciliationem unusquisque Episcopus in propria sua Dioecesi sibi reservaret. . . . Quod ad eos attinet pro quibus, in articulo mortis constitutis, tempus huius facultatis obtinendae defecerit, Nos de reconciliatione eorum facta, in scriptis sine mora, et singulis in casibus, certiores fieri debebimus.

i. The reception of a convert is something essentially pertaining to the external forum, and the censure attached to heresy

is assumed, from canon 2200, §2, to have been incurred. From this censure a priest reconciling a convert in danger of death absolves, relying on the well understood principle that all reservations then cease. There is reason in the above question since this censure is neither *ab homine* nor reserved *specialissimo modo* to the Holy See, and therefore no recourse is necessary when the danger of death has ceased, as stated in canon 2252. Regarding the question uniquely from the point of view of absolving the person from censure it is correctly deduced that recourse is unnecessary. The resolution of the bishops in 1902, still in force, is not at variance with the common law rule, for they do not require recourse under pain of the censure being re-incurred, but merely direct that they are to be informed of reconciliations made in danger of death. The native right of the episcopate for the external forum in everything pertaining to heresy "*sua auctoritate ordinaria*" is fully sustained in canon 2314, §2, and the direction requiring notice about reconciliation can be brought within the familiar phrase "*servatis de iure servandis*" of the same canon.

ii. It is noticeable, moreover, that the episcopal decision of 1902 does not even mention absolution from censure when requiring to be informed of conversions in danger of death, since various views are possible on the question whether all prospective converts are actually under the censure attached to heresy.¹ The point is not strictly relevant to the question we are discussing, and it can be avoided by supposing that the person in danger of death is unbaptized and therefore incapable of incurring a censure. In the common law we cannot discern any regulation requiring the local Ordinary to be informed of conversion whether in danger of death or not, except in canon 744 which directs absolute baptism to be brought to the Ordinary's notice whenever this can be done conveniently; this law is for the purpose of having a greater solemnity at baptisms of this kind, and does not apply to the question we are discussing, since baptism has already been administered. The 1902 regulation of the bishops expressly includes converts from infidelity in its opening phrase, and the use of the word "*reconciliatio*" in requiring to be informed of conversions in danger of death must be held to

¹ Cf. THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1933, V, p. 319.

apply also to converts from infidelity, although the word is technically, perhaps, inapplicable. It is a local law which is of obligation only within the territory of the bishops who enacted it, and its justification is found in the dogmatic principle that bishops have *iure divino* the care of all souls within the dioceses committed to them, a principle reflected in such canons as 334, 335, 451.¹ In the circumstances prevailing in countries where the Church is in a minority, and where conversions and the care of converts has a special importance, the bishops use their right as chief pastors of the flock in requiring to be informed about all conversions to the Church, including cases where absolution from censure is not implicated.

iii. There must be very few priests who can remember the situation as it existed before 1902. As was to be expected, the new regulation was not universally welcomed by the clergy,² although there does not appear to have been any particular criticism of the rule about informing the Ordinary of converts received in danger of death. It was promulgated by individual bishops in their dioceses, and is often repeated in modern collections of diocesan laws, as in *Northampton Statutes* (1947), n. 50.

METHOD OF SINGING THE PASSION

Is it in order for laymen or the congregation to sing the portions assigned to "Synagoga"? (R. C.)

REPLY

S.R.C., 7 July, 1899, n. 4044.2: An permitti possit ut in cantu Passionis Diaconus, qui repraesentat Synagogam, eas tantum sententias cantet quae ab uno proferuntur ut a Petro, Caipha, Pilato, etc.; sententiae vero turbae cantentur a schola, ordinarie ex laicis conflata? *Resp.* Permitti posse.

It is with some surprise that we learn that a method of singing the Passion which is extremely common is actually a

¹ Cf. *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1946, XXVI, p. 550.

² *Pastoralia*, 1902, p. 208.

practice which is merely permitted. A reply dated 1677, n. 1589, described this assumption by lay persons of an office proper to deacons as a scandalous abuse, and one must suppose that the custom of a choir "turba" began with a choir of deacons or at least of clerics, for the music of these responses written by Vitoria and other polyphonic composers existed at least two centuries before the permission given in n. 4044.

The method of its singing has naturally developed into its present form after many modifications. Originally, like the *Exultet*, it was sung by one deacon, but three had become customary by the fifteenth century, and the signs "†", "C" and "S" were used, though not universally, to denote the portions of each.¹ *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*, II, xxi, 15, still supposes that the three deacons are using one book and gives directions for the assistance of acolytes in passing the book from one to the other. At Rouen in the eighteenth century the ancient custom continued of one deacon singing the passion in the tone of a gospel. "S" which we are accustomed to take as "Synagoga", was, perhaps, originally an abbreviation for "Sursum". Certainly by 1706 the custom of the choir in collegiate churches singing the plural passages of "S" was accepted, for a reply, 17 June of that year, n. 2169, very sternly forbids a choir of nuns to do the same.²

If a congregation could be taught how to sing the portions representing "turba", this could be brought within the direction of n. 4044, and indeed would be an excellent way of encouraging their active participation in the liturgical office.

E. J. M.

¹ THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1947, XXVII, p. 353.

² Q.L.P., 1923, pp. 1-15, gives a good historical account of the subject.
Vol. xxxii

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

JUBILEE FACULTIES FOR PRIEST PILGRIMS

SACRA PAENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA

FACULTATES

CONFESSARIIS PEREGRINIS CONCESSAE ANNO VERTENTE GENERALIS
MAXIMIQUE IUBILAEI MDCCCCL (A.A.S., 1949, XLI, p. 518).

I

Facultates speciales quae tribuntur omnibus Confessariis peregrinis qui iam in sua Dioecesi rite approbati sint pro utroque sexu, quibusque pro foro conscientiae et in sacramentali confessione tantum uti valeant :

1. Absolvendi quaslibet personas sibi confitentes a quibusvis peccatis et censuris a iure reservatis aut Ordinario, aut, etiam speciali modo, Romano Pontifici, dummodo censurae publicae non sint; iniunctis salutaribus paenitentibus atque aliis de iure iniungendis.

Ne absolvant igitur, nisi in adiunctis atque ad praescriptum can. 2254 Codicis iuris canonici, eos, qui irretiti sint aliqua censura vel Romano Pontifici personaliter, vel specialissimo modo Apostolicae Sedi reservata. Ne absolvant pariter illos, qui in censuram inciderint, de qua in can. 2388, §1, Sanctae Sedi reservatam ad normam Decreti "Lex sacri coelibatus" per Sacram Paenitentiarium Apostolicam editi die xviii mensis Aprilis anni MDCCCXXXVI (cfr. *Acta Apost. Sedis*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 242), itemque ad normam Declarationis ab eadem Sacra Paenitentiarium datae die iv mensis Maii anni MDCCCXXXVII (cfr. *Acta Apost. Sedis*, Vol. XXIX, p. 283); vi cuius Decreti et Declarationis haec censura in casu speciali, de quo agitur, ita Sacrae Paenitentiarium reservatur, ut nemo unquam, excepto periculo mortis, ab ea absolvere possit, ne vi quidem can. 2254.

2. Commutandi in alia pia opera, ex iusta causa, omnia et singula vota privata, etiam iurata, exceptis iis votis privatis quae can. 1309 Apostolicae Sedi reservantur; itemque exceptis iis quorum commutatio vergeret in detrimentum tertii, aut commutatio minus arceret a peccato quam ipsum votum.

3. Concedendi dispensationem visitationis alicuius Basilicae eam commutando in visitationem, si fieri potest, alius ecclesiae, immo

etiam visitationum numerum imminuendi. Quos vero recte a visitationibus dispensaverint, iis ne indulgeant, ut preces ad mentem Summi Pontificis fundendas, quae a visitatione separari quidem possunt, praetermittant. In commodum tantum aegrotantium eas liceat imminuere.

II

Facultates speciales quae Decem Confessariis peregrinis, ab hac S. Paenitentiaria, vel ab Episcopo proprio selectis, tribuuntur ad confessiones sociorum peregrinorum accipiendas, quibusque pro foro conscientiae et in sacramentali confessione tantum uti valeant :

1. Absolvendi non solum a censuris et excessibus occultis, prout statuitur sub n. I, 1, pro omnibus confessariis peregrinis, sed etiam a censuris *quae sint publicae* in locis ubi commorati sunt paenitentes vel ibi nominatim declaratae sint aut quamvis delictum ad iudicem fori externi iam fuerit deductum, dummodo sint sincere parati quodvis mandatum demisse accipere fideliterque adimplere et scandalum reparare. Huius tamen censurae absolutio in foro externo non suffragabitur. Ne absolvant tamen, nisi ad tramitem can. 2254, praelatos cleri saecularis ordinaria iurisdictione praeditos, superioresque maiores religionis exemptae, qui in censuras *speciali modo* Romano Pontifici reservatas *publice* inciderint.

2. Dispensandi constitutos in Sacris, ad Ordines tantum exercendos, ab irregularitatibus ex delicto occulto, non exclusa irregularitate de qua in can. 985, 4°.

3. Dispensandi circa visitationes quatuor Basilicarum, easque item commutandi eodem modo ac ceteris confessariis conceditur sub n. I, 3.

4. Commutandi in alia pia opera, ex iusta causa, omnia ac singula *vota privata*, iurata quoque et etiam Sedi Apostolicae reservata. Similiter possint commutare votum castitatis perpetuae ac perfectae, etsi fuerit ab origine *publice* emissum in professione religiosa etiam solemniter et firmum manserit, aliis huius professionis votis relaxatis. Nullatenus tamen ab eodem illos dispensare possint qui vi Ordinis Sacri ad legem coelibatus tenentur, etiamsi ad statum laicalem reducti sint. A commutatione votorum se absterneant si commutatio tertio praecudicium afferat ac minus arceat a peccato quam ipsa commutatio.

5. Dispensandi ab occulto impedimento consanguinitatis in tertio vel secundo gradu collateraliter, etiam attingente primum, quod ex

generatione illicita proveniat, solummodo ad matrimonium convalidandum, non vero ad contrahendum vel sanandum in radice.

6. Dispensandi ab occulto criminis impedimento, neutro machinante, sive agatur de matrimonio contracto sive de contrahendo, iniuncta, in primo casu, privata renovatione consensus, secundum can. 1135; imposita, in utroque, gravi ac diuturna paenitentia salutari.

MONITA

DE USU FACULTATUM CONFESSARIIS PEREGRINIS TRIBUTARUM

1. His facultatibus specialibus confessarii peregrini ubicumque in Urbe et suburbio, servatis can. 908-910 et de consensu rectorum ecclesiarum, cum sociis peregrinis uti poterunt, ita tamen ut eas valide exercere valeant si unus vel alter peregrinus non socius, cum peregrinis sociis, ad ipsos confitendi causa accedat.

2. Item his facultatibus tantummodo uti poterunt erga paenitentes qui ad confitendum accedant *ea mente et sincera voluntate* ut Iubilaei veniam consequantur; attamen si paenitens, mutato proposito, ab acquirenda indulgentia Iubilaei destiterit atque cetera opera imperata intermiserit, omnes absolutiones censurarum, si eas excipias quae ad reincidentiam datae sint, itemque commutationes et dispensationes concessae in suo robore permaneant.

3. Similiter his facultatibus absolvendi a peccatis et censuris reservatis itemque dispensandi ab irregularitatibus nonnisi *semel* cum eodem paenitente uti poterunt, cum ipse scilicet Iubilaei veniam primum lucretur et tum solummodo cum paenitens iam ab alio confessario, facultatem habente per anni sancti decursum, a peccatis et censuris non fuerit absolutus vel ab irregularitate iam dispensationem non obtinuerit. Ceteras vero facultates—eam etiam visitationes contrahendi aut commutandi ad datam normam sub n. I, 3—in favorem etiam eiusdem paenitentis semper exercere poterunt.

4. Firmae et immutatae remaneant facultates quas omnes confessarii peregrini per S. Paenitentiarum vel alio legitimo modo consecuti sunt vel consequentur.

5. Haereticos et schismaticos qui fuerint publice dogmatizantes ne absolvant nisi ii, praeter haeresis et schismatis abiurationem, saltem coram ipso confessario factam, scandalum, ut par est, reparaverint. Ne absolvant praeterea eos qui in rerum adiunctis versantur,

de quibus agitur in Decreto Supremae Sacrae Congregationis Sancti Officii, die 1 mensis Iulii anni MDCCCXXXIX edito, de Communismo (cfr. *Acta Apost. Sedis*, Vol. XXXXI, pag. 334), nisi eodem modo, uti supra, resipuerint.

6. Ne absolvant eos qui sectis vetitis, massonicis aliisque id genus, nomen dederint, etiamsi occulti sint, nisi, abiurata, saltem coram ipso confessario, secta, scandalum reparaverint et a quavis activa cooperatione vel favore suae cuiusque sectae praestando cessaverint; nisi ecclesiasticos et religiosos, quos sectae adscriptos noverint, ad can. 2336, §2, denunciaverint; nisi libros, manu scripta et signa, quae eandem sectam respiciant, quotiescumque adhuc retineant, absolventi tradiderint aut se ea tradituros vel destructuros serio promiserint, imposita, pro modo culparum, gravi poenitentia salutari.

7. A lectione librorum prohibitorum ne quemquam absolvant, nisi is libros, quos penes se retinet, Ordinario aut confessario tradiderit aut se eos traditurum vel destructurum serio promiserit.

8. Si quis in occultas censuras ob partem quoquo modo laesam inciderit, eum ne ante absolvant, quam parti laesae, etiam scandalum reparando damnumque sarciendo, satisfecerit: aut saltem, si eiusmodi satisfactionem praestare ante non possit, vere graviterque promiserit se, cum primum licuerit, satisfacturum.

9. Si de casu agatur, etiamsi occulto, de quo ad can. 2342, prohibeant, sub poena reincidentiae, quominus in posterum accedant ad religiosam domum illam eiusque ecclesiam.

10. Eos, qui bona vel iura ecclesiastica sine venia acquisiverint, ne absolvant nisi aut iis restitutis aut compositione quamprimum a competente auctoritate postulata, aut promissione sincere facta eandem postulandi, nisi agatur de locis, in quibus a Sede Apostolica aliter iam provisum fuerit.

11. Non praetermittant suam cuique poenitenti salutarem poenitentiam sacramentalem imponere, etiamsi sibi coniicere iure liceat poenitentem plenissimam Iubilaei veniam esse consecuturum.

12. Confessio et Communio ad lucranda Iubilaei indulgentiam nihil refert utrum visitationibus quatuor Basilicarum antecendant, interponantur vel succedant; unum necesse est ut postremum ex praescriptis opus, quod etiam Communio esse potest, in statu gratiae, ad can. 925, §1, compleatur. Ab obligatione praescriptae confessionis neminem exsolvant; neque fas est, Communionem in alia pia opera commutare, nisi agatur de aegrotis.

13. Visitationem Basilicarum ne commutent in alia opera, quae ad peragenda poenitens sit alio obligationis propriae dictae titulo adstrictus; et sciant se conscientiam suam oneraturos si inconsulto

aut sine iusta causa paenitentem ex eiusmodi visitationibus exemerint.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus Sacrae Paenitentiariae, die xvii mensis Septembris, anno MDCCCXXXIX.

N. Card. CANALI, *Paenitentiaris Maior*.

The same number of *A.A.S.* contains also a series of MONITA chiefly for the guidance of the Roman Penitentiaries and confessors mentioned in the Apostolic Constitution *Decessorum Nostrorum*, 10 July, 1949.

BOOK REVIEWS

A NEW LATIN-ENGLISH MISSAL

The Missal in Latin and English. Being the text of the *Missale Romanum* with English rubrics and a new translation. Pp. 1284 + 269 + 160. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 25s. and upwards according to binding.)

THIS missal is not a reprint or merely a bringing up to date of some existing edition, but a new venture both in translation and in arrangement upon which the editors and the publishers have been engaged for some years. The problem of restricting the volume to a manageable size has been largely solved by eliminating liturgical notes, lives of Saints, popular devotions, various extracts from the Breviary or Ritual and what not, which of late years have increased the bulk of some editions beyond all reason. Instead we have the full text of the Roman Missal in Latin and English throughout, with all the latest Masses, including those authorized by special grant in certain places, as for example the Commemoration of All Holy Pontiffs on 3 July.

The arrangement of the text has several notable features introduced as an aid to its use. Instead of the Ordinary of the Mass being printed with the Canon at the beginning of the book, where it inevitably suffers from constant use, separate texts for high and low Mass are inserted at the middle before the Masses of the Saints, together with the special prefaces and the whole text of the Preparation and Thanksgiving prayers. The Ordinary of the Requiem Mass, being in

such frequent use, is reprinted in its appropriate place among the Masses for the Dead. A supplement contains the Masses approved by the Holy See for use in England, Scotland and Wales, the series being continuous according to date since many of these Masses are used in more than one diocese.

The translation of all the Scriptural portions is in the version just happily completed by Monsignor Ronald Knox, and whatever views one has formed about it will apply equally to its use in this Missal. Mgr Knox's version of the psalms is from the old Latin text, which the Missal still contains. There can be no question that the inclusion of Mgr Knox's version would alone be sufficient to recommend this Missal to the faithful. Their appreciation and understanding of the sacred text will be increased when reading passages such as the description of the valiant woman, the woman of the golden alphabet, in the Common of Holy Women, where the alphabetical sequence of each sentence is so admirably preserved.

It is, however, in the non-Scriptural portions, particularly in the collects, that the specific value of this new Missal consists, and it is evident that the translators have been at considerable pains to provide a version which is both accurate and euphonious. One passage from the Canon, *Quam oblationem*, etc., the meaning of which is obscure in the original, must suffice to measure the translators' skill. The translation usually found in prayer books from the same publishing house is "Which oblation do thou, O God, vouchsafe in all respects to bless, approve, ratify and accept". In the new translation the relative clause here as elsewhere in the Canon is transposed, and the five objects of petition are so arranged that the prayer reads: "We pray thee, God, be pleased to make this same offering wholly blessed, to consecrate it and approve it, making it reasonable and acceptable". This translation of a most difficult passage cannot, we think, be improved upon, though there are bound to be differences of opinion about it, as about many other translated portions. Personally we are not enamoured of "And with you" as a translation of "Et cum spiritu tuo". The hebraism being in the Latin and familiar to English people from the *Book of Common Prayer* could properly be left in every English version. The short and modest preface mentions the convenience of students as the reason for numbering all the prayers, an excellent idea; it will be of great assistance to the many students who, in these days of renewed liturgical interest, may wish to discuss the appropriateness of certain translations in this Missal.

The publishers are right in calling attention to the fine quality of the printing. To the best of our knowledge it is the only English

Missal printed in the traditional red and black throughout, a feature which distinguished an earlier Missal of the same house which has long been unobtainable.

It is a happy circumstance that the translation of a book which enshrines *meum et vestrum sacrificium* has been the joint work of a priest and a layman. Fr O'Connell and Mr Finberg are to be congratulated most sincerely on the completion of their labours, a notable step in attaining what the Holy Father in *Mediator Dei* so strongly desires: "Laudibus igitur ii digni sunt, qui eo consilio ducti, ut christiana plebs Eucharisticum Sacrificium facilius salubriusque participet, 'Missale Romanum' apte in populi manibus ponere conantur, ita quidem ut christifideles, una cum sacerdote copulati, iisdem eius verbis iisdemque Ecclesiae sensibus comprecentur."

E. J. M.

La Dame Toute Belle. An objective and psychological study of the events at Fatima. By Fr J. D. Rambaud, O.P. Pp. 186. (Emmanuel Vitte, Lyons and Paris. No price.)

It is with timidity that one approaches any event that may be supernatural from the "critical" angle, partly because one does not want to lay rough hands upon the Ark, and also because one risks brushing the bloom off what inspires so many with devotion. Still, we are sure that an "objective" examination of such events must be made sooner or later and that "psychology" must play its important part therein. So we think that Fr Rambaud is amply justified in wishing to write about Fatima so as to help those who are "prejudiced" against it or frankly disbelieve in the divine origin of what happened there. He begins by affirming that "this book is sharply differentiated from those that so far have been published". But we feel that this is not so. Like all other authors (I think), he interweaves what Lucia wrote in 1942 with what she said in 1917, and this surely assumes a sort of psychological miracle owing to which during nearly a quarter of a century her recollections were never fused or modified (indeed, her memory was not perfect and there are not a few small contradictions in her accounts—e.g. at the time she said there were no stars on our Lady's dress; then, 1921, that there were three; now she has settled down to one). The author seems to me to omit the *real* difficulties that suggest themselves. He says nothing of the triple apparition of a "sheeted form" which, in 1917, Lucia and her mother said was seen in 1916 just when, much later, Lucia related that the triple apparition of an Angel had occurred. The "sheeted form" is now relegated to 1915; a critic would be tempted to think,

lest it should coincide with the angelic apparition. The Angel spoke of the "infinite merits of the S. Heart of Jesus and of the Immaculate Heart of Mary": Fr Rambaud, like others, inserts: "and the *intercession* of the Immaculate Heart". He does not say what the two much younger children made of a Communion under the species of Wine—neither of them were to think they then made their "First Communion". (On the other hand, Lucia did mention—briefly—the Angel before May 1942 (p. 47), e.g. in 1937.) Lucia insists that a friend Amelia was in Purgatory "till the end of the world": this has shocked many: the author (with others) omits the last words. It is often asked how the Lady could constantly say that she would tell the children who she was on 13 October ("only on 13 October"—some writers omit the embarrassing "only") if she no less constantly spoke of her Immaculate Heart: one answer is, that in Portugal "Our Lady" is considered insufficient unless she be *defined* as "of the Rosary; of Sorrows; of Necessities": not all, I found, in Portugal accept this solution. The author (like most others) does not say that the prismatic colours round the sun were seen several times, not only on 13 October (e.g. on 19 August): he does not mention that both Lucia and Jacinta (Francisco never heard anything) insisted that our Lady said the war was ending *that day* (13 October, 1917); that Lucia demanded, first, that the Holy Father should consecrate Russia *along with all the bishops of the world on one special day*: if he did, Russia would be converted and there would be no second war (Lucia says that this promise was *unconditional*): if he did not, war would break out "in the next pontificate", which it did not. He does not mention that when the "miracle of the sun" occurred, not all (Lucia agrees) saw the same thing, and some saw nothing at all. In fine, I do not think the author discusses the 1942 statements of Lucia, as such, at all, and yet it is they which provide the major difficulties. Not that they injure, for me, belief in the authenticity of the apparitions or of our Lady's message; I mention the "difficulties" that I have (there are others), because I fear that the author does not help those, precisely, who are conscious of such complexities but find they are not alluded to. Perhaps his style is sometimes rather rhetorical: "at the first blows of the pick, water gushed forth" (p. 26): but they had to dig till they got down to rock and then they had to blast their way still deeper. Or again, he mitigates the facts: the children endured "*presque des coups*" (p. 7): but Lucia was black and blue from her mother's "broomstick": "even St Anthony," said her sister, "could not have cured her bruises." To make up, he quotes Jacinta as saying that St Anthony is not so "pretty" as the Lady (does *bonito* mean, here, more than "nice"—"not so good"?), and when he saw

the rosy well-shaven Saint in the parish church he asked whether that was the one the children saw. No: the older very ungainly statue had been relegated to the sacristy. . . . We ourselves saw a perfectly delightful Portuguese St Anthony, very plump and jolly—in short, so unconventional that we were told on no account to take that picture home.

C. C. M.

SOME THEOLOGICAL TEXT BOOKS

- De Virtutibus Theologicis.* By R. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P. Pp. xi + 584. (L.I.C.E., Berruti, Turin. No price.)
- De Peccato Originali et De Verbo Incarnato.* By M. Daffara, O.P. Pp. xxiii + 462. (Marietti, Turin. No price.)
- De Deo Uno et Trino—De Deo Creante et Elevante.* By C. Bozzola, S.J. Pp. iv + 320. (D'Auria, Naples. Price \$1.75; bound \$2.50.)
- De Verbo Incarnato. De Gratia et de Virtutibus.* By C. Bozzola—C. Greppi, S.J. Pp. iv + 320. (D'Auria, Naples. Price \$1.75; bound \$2.50.)
- De Verbo Incarnato et De B. V. Maria.* By C. Larnicol. C.S.Sp. Pp. 243. (Catholic Book Agency, Rome. No price.)
- Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae.* Vol. I. *De Revelatione Christiana—De Ecclesia Christi—De Fontibus Revelationis.* By J. M. Hervé. New edition 1949. Pp. xxvi + 626. (Berche et Pagis, Paris. No price.)
- De Poenitentia. I. De Sacramento et Virtute.* By E. Doronzo. Pp. x + 517. (Bruce, Milwaukee, 1949. Price \$7.50.)

IN *De Virtutibus Theologicis*, which completes his course of dogmatic theology, Père Garrigou-Lagrange follows the method with which readers of his other works will be familiar: that of commenting on the articles of the *Summa* in order, and in such a way that for a proper understanding of the commentary it is necessary to have the text of St Thomas always at hand. On the various questions concerning the infused virtues which are in dispute the author's views are well known, and they are set forth here with his accustomed definiteness and vigour. Dominating the whole treatise is the principle that supernatural virtues are differentiated from acquired virtues by their supernatural formal objects, a principle which, according to the learned Dominican, it is impossible to abandon without entering upon the dangerous path of nominalism and so approaching semi-pelagianism (pp. ix, 5). For this reason he thinks it unnecessary even to quote certain recent doctorate theses on the subject of supernatural faith, "quia non sunt satis elaboratae et non considerant, ut

oporteret, momentum principii 'habitus et actus specificantur . . . ' (p. 58, n.). Within the limits set by these conditions, the work under review is valuable as recording the views of the stricter Dominican school on these important questions, and as providing—especially in the sections on charity and the gifts—the dogmatic basis of the author's well-known treatises on Christian perfection. As a manual for seminarists, however, it has drawbacks. While the method adopted by Père Garrigou-Lagrange is an efficacious means of ensuring that the student shall read the text of the *Summa* "article par article", it may be questioned whether pedagogically, at least, this is always desirable; the exigencies of a given historical situation may often necessitate a way of approach different from that which was useful in the thirteenth century. Moreover, such an article-by-article commentary will not serve the need of the young student for a work of ready reference unless it is provided with schematic and alphabetical indices which are both ample and accurate. An alphabetical index, including both names and subjects, which contains little more than eighty headings, can hardly be regarded as adequate in the present instance. Nor can it be described as accurate. For example, the indication *Meritum, radix ejus in caritate* directs the reader to pp. 414–19, where the author comments at length on II-IIae, 24, 6: "Utrum quolibet actu caritatis caritas augeatur". Much may be found here on the complicated question whether the virtue of charity is increased by remiss acts of charity or not; but of the basic function of charity, which is to lend a meritorious character to all the virtuous activities of man, nothing is said here either by St Thomas or by his commentator. This important aspect of charity is dealt with in other parts of the *Summa* (e.g. I-IIae, 114, 4; II-IIae, 83, 15; II-IIae, 182, 2) which the limits imposed by the author's method exclude from his consideration in the present volume.

Father M. Daffara, O.P., in *De Peccato Originali et De Verbo Incarnato*, while following faithfully the teaching of the Angelic Doctor, does not hesitate to modify the order of his treatment whenever he considers it advisable: the result is a manual well adapted to the needs of the modern student of theology. Nor, when a Jesuit theologian succeeds in presenting the teaching of St Thomas (e.g. on original sin) more clearly even than Billuart, does he refuse to give him credit for it or even to abandon the Dominican theologian in his favour. He is always scrupulous to distinguish between what is binding on our belief and what is a matter of opinion, and in differing on these points from his opponents is careful to insist that

their views do not even remotely conflict with the faith. In each of the two treatises before us we find that judicious combination of the historical and the explanatory which has been found most suited to modern needs. Even quite recent controversies receive adequate attention, though in some cases, e.g. on the question of "the state of pure nature", the periodical literature quoted does not reach beyond the pre-war period. On disputed questions the author's positions are as follows: original justice is seen as consisting of sanctifying grace together with the preternatural gifts; the "vulneratio naturae" is not understood as an intrinsic deterioration of natural powers; the Incarnation would not have taken place but for man's sin; the hypostatic union is the proximate foundation of the impeccability of Christ, an impeccability which is compatible with a real divine command to die for our salvation; little partiality is shown for Cajetan's substantial mode as an explanation of the hypostatic union; and in a brief compendium of Mariology which, like St Thomas, the author treats in connexion with Christ's "entry into this world", he appears to abstract from the famous controversy which turns on the distinction between subjective and objective redemption. Though he omits all mention of the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* in dealing with the "gratia capitis", yet he includes, in compensation, a number of subjects—the descent into hell, the resurrection and the ascension of Christ—which are usually neglected in manuals of Christology.

Fathers C. Bozzola, S.J., and C. Greppi, S.J., are responsible for the second and third volumes of a theological course of which we have already noticed the first and fourth.¹ Volume II, of which Father Bozzola is the sole author, contains the following treatises: *De Deo Uno et Trino*, *De Deo Creante et Elevante*, *De Peccato Originali* and *De Novissimis*. That the writer should have contrived to include so much theology within the space of some 300 pages is a tribute to his powers of compression, as well as to the shrewd judgement with which he has selected for treatment only the matters that are essential for beginners. While adopting in such questions as those of the divine knowledge and predestination the positions which we have learned to associate with theologians of the Society, he treats the opposite views with courtesy and respect, e.g.: "(sententia Banesiana) pluribus non videtur eadem facilitate salvare humanam libertatem." On the problem of the origin of the human body Father Bozzola follows the majority of the text-books in disallowing any sort of

¹ See THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1948, XXX, pp. 126-7.

transformism, but he also hints that the contrary view, by reason of the respectable body of theological opinion which now favours it, no longer deserves to be branded as "temerarious". He considers that the essentials of the doctrine of original sin can be safeguarded only if Adam is regarded as in some sense the juridical head of mankind. It is to be noticed, finally, that the severe limitation of his space has not caused him to omit a reference (admittedly summary) to recent controversies on the state of pure nature and on the meaning of the supernatural.

In Volume III (*De Verbo Incarnato et Redemptore, De B. Maria Virgine, De Gratia, De Virtutibus*) Father Bozzola has Father Greppi as his collaborator, and its scope and style are similar to those of the second volume. The opinion of Capreolus is favoured in connexion with the hypostatic union, Mary's proximate co-operation in objective redemption is defended, and in the treatise *De Gratia* we find the familiar theses of the Jesuit school. It ought to be said, perhaps, that of the four volumes in the course this is the least satisfactory. The exigencies of space are possibly felt more acutely here; but many will think that in the circumstances we might have been spared much of the discussion on actual grace, and so received a correspondingly fuller treatment of important questions concerning sanctifying grace and the infused virtues.

Father C. Larnicol, C.S.Sp., who is not so much preoccupied with considerations of space, is able to give us a more extended treatment of the questions that interest him in the treatise *De Verbo Incarnato et Redemptore*. In particular he has been able to include a study of the Mystical Body of Christ, considering it first, as St Thomas does, in the wide sense according to which it comprises all rational creatures with the exception of the reprobate, and then in the strict sense as the visible Church on earth, as it is primarily considered in the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis*. On the question of the formal constituent of personality the author favours the view of Capreolus, with some mention of de la Taille's distinction between *actus* and *actuatio*, a distinction which, in the author's opinion, does little to clarify the matter. The treatise of Mariology with which the volume concludes is brief but comprehensive. Had Father Larnicol been able to make it longer he might have devoted more attention to the serious objections that are raised to the theory of Mary's proximate co-operation in objective redemption, a theory which he is inclined to accept in view of the considerable number of theologians who now support it. The definability of the Assumption as a dogma of faith he considers

to be "saltem probabilis, atque communior sententia theologorum, aliis tamen adhuc dubitantibus".

Canon Hervé's *Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae*, in four volumes, is too well known to need any detailed description here, and the fact that a text-book first published twenty-three years ago has now reached, and by this time doubtless surpassed, its fortieth thousand is a proof of the wide popularity it has deserved. As a manual for seminarists it was by no means the first in the field; Canon Hervé's work has thus been able to make its way to the front by sheer merit against redoubtable rivals. But if the work stands in no need of our commendation, yet the new edition of 1949, of which we have so far received only the first volume, calls for special attention by reason of the extensive changes which the author has made in it. This is truly a new edition, not a mere reprint, and the manual has been entirely re-set. The logical order has been carefully readjusted, bibliography and references have been brought up to date, a more extended treatment is now given to points which recent developments have brought into prominence, and here and there (e.g. in the question of the necessity of religion) one discerns a revision due either to the author's second and better thoughts, or to the suggestions of friendly critics. Here are some of the more notable features of the new edition, so far as the first volume is concerned: Much of what had previously been said about Modernism has now been omitted; the terminology in regard to the different categories of the supernatural has been modified; greater insistence still is laid on the external criteria of revelation, and the natural discernibility of the miracle as a supernatural sign is defended more vigorously than before against the opinion associated with the names of Rousselot, Huby, Masure and Aubert. The treatment of the miracles of Christ, and especially of His resurrection, has been re-cast with good results, and the same is to be said of the chapters on Buddhism and Islam. Considerable changes in the treatise *De Ecclesia* result in a clearer distinction between the apologetic consideration of the Church and the dogmatic theses concerning it. In previous editions Canon Hervé had already dealt at some length with the Church considered as the Mystical Body of Christ; this theological aspect of the Church now receives a much more ample development, a wide use being made of the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis*, the influence of which may be seen also in the author's treatment of the delicate question of Church membership. Other useful additions are those of a chapter on the duties of members of the Church, with special reference to the theological implications of Catholic Action, and of an appropriate appen-

dix on the subject of the Missions. The first volume of this text-book is truly up to date; and the publishers promise us that the remaining three volumes have been subjected to a similarly thorough process of revision and improvement.

The four earlier volumes in Dr Doronzo's course of studies on the Sacraments have already been reviewed in these pages.¹ The present volume is the first in a series of four which are to be devoted to the Sacrament of Penance, and this fact alone suffices to show what thoroughness and erudition the learned author brings to his task. He adopts the order of treatment which St Thomas indicated and which the Saint would himself have followed had he lived to complete his work; accordingly, departing from the method which has become popular among dogmatic theologians since Suarez and which treats of the virtue of penance in an introductory chapter, he prefers to begin with a consideration of the sacrament (its institution and essence) and then to consider the virtue of penance, which is really the source from which the acts of the penitent (the matter of the sacrament) proceed. This forms the subject matter of the volume under review. The second volume will deal with Contrition and Confession, the third with Satisfaction and Absolution, while the fourth and last will contain a study of the effects and properties of the sacrament, the power of the keys understood in a wide sense, indulgences, and the ceremonies associated with Penance. In the section on the institution of the Sacrament, which forms about one third of this volume, Dr Doronzo deals very fully with the important question, so much debated in modern times with Liberal Protestants, of the precise meaning which the Church has always attached to the remission of sin in her penitential discipline. His exegesis of the scriptural texts is most thorough and accurate, and the patristic evidence—in the evaluation of which he makes copious use of the work of d'Alès and Galtier—is set forth by him so fully that the student has little occasion to refer to the texts of the Fathers themselves. Dr Doronzo's preference for the speculative side of theology allows itself full scope in the latter part of the volume, where no fewer than two hundred and fifty pages are given to a profound study of the virtue of penance, and where his insistence on the essentially supernatural character of that virtue earns for him a special word of praise from Père Garrigou-Lagrange, who contributes a brief preface.

G. D. S.

¹ See *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1947, XXVII, pp. 186-7; 1948, XXIX, pp. 120-1; 1948, XXX, pp. 123-5.

- S. *Thomae Aquinatis, Quaestiones Disputatae*. In-4 p., nova ed. VIII, 1949. (Marietti, Turin.)
 Vol. I: *De Veritate*. Cura et studio P. R. Spiazzi, S.T.L., O.P. Pp. xxx + 594. (Price 2000 lire.)
 Vol. II: *De Potentia, De Spiritualibus Creaturis, De Anima, De Unione Verbi Incarnati, De Virtutibus in Communi, De Caritate, De Virtutibus Cardinalibus, De Correctione Fraterna, De Spe, De Malo*. Cura et studio PP. P. Bazzi, M. Calcaterra, T. Centi, Ae. Odetto, P. Pession, S.T.L., O.P. Pp. 950. (Price 2500 lire.)
 S. *Thomae Aquinatis, Quaestiones Quodlibetales*. In-4 p., nova ed. VIII, 1949; cura et studio P. R. Spiazzi, S.T.L., O.P. Pp. xxiii + 269. (Marietti, Turin. Price 900 lire.)

UNIFORM with the new manual edition of the *Summa Theologiae* which reproduces the Leonine text,¹ we now have from the same enterprising house of Marietti a revised edition of the *Quaestiones Disputatae* and *Quodlibetales*. Pending the completion of the work of the Leonine Commission, the editors have endeavoured here to give us the best text available in the light of expert research and to make the task of consulting it as easy as possible. Thus, the logical division of arguments has been emphasized by typographical devices; in addition to the usual numbering under each question, the articles are numbered progressively throughout each work by means of marginal numerals in heavy type; the titles of articles have been modified to conform to the original text; parallel passages from other works are given in footnotes; scriptural texts have been revised, and the Vulgate text given at the foot of the page; historical notes are provided where certain names or words seem to call for them; and the results of recent scholarship have also been used to adjust the chronological order of the *Quaestiones*. Each of the three volumes is prefaced by a careful introduction which gives valuable information regarding the method, history and chronology of these disputations, as well as a scheme illustrating the structure of each. Finally, the value of the edition is enhanced by useful indices, scriptural, nominal, bibliographical, and analytical. The editors are to be congratulated on the care with which they have done their work, and the publishers on the very handsome production of these volumes.

G. D. S.

¹ See THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1949, XXXI, pp. 211-2.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

h
-
e
e
st
of
i-
o
d
ls
m
in
ct
r-
nt
of
ul
d,
ne
is
nd
th
ry